

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

JUL 1 - 1935

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND OLBORN REVIEW

•EDITOR• B•AQUILA•BARBER•

JULY, 1935

CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

The Venerable Bede J. Scott Lidgett, C.H., M.A., B.D.
John Wesley as a Bookman George Jackson, B.A., D.D.
Dr. Klausner's Estimate of Jesus C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D.
Shakespeare's Brutus: A Character Study E. B. Storr
British Travellers on American Manners Montagu Frank Modder, M.A., Ph.D.
The Beginnings of Christianity in Ireland W. G. Hanson
A Medieval Churchman and World Unity D. W. Lewis, D.D.
Judaism and Gentile Christianity in the Third Century A. Marmorstein, M.A., Ph.D.
President Monroe and His Doctrine J. A. Lovat-Fraser, M.P.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS:

Some Catholic Apologetics W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.
'The Unfinished Universe' R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.
The Newly-Discovered Fragment of Titian Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., D.D.
The New Tischendorf Roger B. Lloyd, M.A.
Humanist and Christian H. Bett, M.A., Litt.D.
A New Critical Approach to the Gospels Atkinson Lee, M.A.
Bergson's Philosophy of Religion N. M. Cuthbert
Reunion from the Methodist Point of View

RECENT LITERATURE:

Theology and Apologetics; History, Biography, Travel; General: C. Ryder Smith, D.D.; Vincent Taylor, D.D.; H. Roberts, Ph.D.; R. E. Roberts, D.D.; W. R. Chapman; T. W. Bevan; David Cooke; F. B. Clegg, M.A.; A. W. Harrison, M.C., D.D.; J. T. Brewis, B.A., B.D.; John Telford, B.A.; F. W. H. Allison, A.R.I.B.A.; E. Rogers, M.A., B.D.

OBITER DICTA

PERIODICAL LITERATURE:

The Editor

British, American, Foreign

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS
EDGAR-C-BARTON
25-35 CITY ROAD • E.C.1



"The youth of a nation are the trustees of prosperity"

Dickie.

WHO can tell what one little child may become, or how wide an influence it may have in the years that lie ahead? The answer to that question depends largely upon the conditions surrounding the impressionable years of childhood.

The foundations of the National Children's Homes were laid to give youth its chance, and nearly 4,000 of the nation's children are now being prepared for some worthy part in the life of the future. Your sympathy and support will help to make their dreams come true.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME AND ORPHANAGE

(Founded by Dr. Stephen, 1869)

Principal: REV. JOHN H. LITTEN

General Treasurer:

KT. HON. VISCOUNT WAKEFIELD
SIR THOMAS BARLOW, BART., M.D., F.R.S.

Chief Offices:

Highbury Park, London, N.L.

Telephone: Hove 1-1000

Telex: 100000 NCHL L



Ju
It
mi

'T
ad

All

N

R

O
P

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

**RELIGION, THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE
HISTORY and SOCIOLOGY.**

Editor:
B. AQUILA BARBER

Advisory Council:

ARCHIBALD W. HARRISON, M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D.	ROBERT STRONG, M.A., B.Litt.
WILBERT F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D. W. LANSDELL WARDLE, M.A., D.D.	JOHN TELFORD, B.A.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 2s. 6d. a copy (postage 3d.) or 10s. per annum post free.

All contributions (typewritten if possible) should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review,' 25-35, City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

JULY, 1935

CONTENTS

(Biographical sketches of contributors p. iv.)

ARTICLES :

THE VENERABLE BEDE J. SCOTT LIDGETT, C.H., M.A.,
D.D.
JOHN WESLEY AS A BOOKMAN GEORGE JACKSON, B.A., D.D.
DR. KLAUSNER'S ESTIMATE OF JESUS C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D.
SHAKESPEARE'S BRUTUS: A CHARACTER STUDY E. B. STORR
BRITISH TRAVELLERS ON AMERICAN MONTAGU FRANK MODDER,
MANNERS M.A., Ph.D.
THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY IN IRELAND W. G. HANSON
A MEDIEVAL CHURCHMAN AND
WORLD UNITY D. W. LOWIS, D.D.
JUDAISM AND GENTILE CHRISTIANITY
IN THE THIRD CENTURY A. MARMORSTEIN, M.A., Ph.D.
PRESIDENT MONROE AND HIS DOCTRINE J. A. LOVAT-FRASER, M.P.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS :

SOME CATHOLIC APOLOGIAS W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A., D.D.
'THE UNFINISHED UNIVERSE' R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.
THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED FRAGMENT OF TATIAN
THE NEW TISCHENDORF WILBERT F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D.
HUMANIST AND CHRISTIAN ROGER B. LLOYD, M.A.
A NEW CRITICAL APPROACH TO THE
GOSPELS
BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION H. BETT, M.A., Litt. D.
REUNION FROM THE METHODIST
POINT OF VIEW N. M. CUTHERBERT
ATKINSON LEE, M.A.

RECENT LITERATURE: THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS; HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL; GENERAL:

C. RYDER SMITH, D.D.; VINCENT TAYLOR, D.D.; H. ROBERTS, PH.D.; R. E. ROBERTS, D.D.; W. R. CHAPMAN; T. W. BEVAN; DAVID COOKE; F. B. CLOGG, M.A.; A. W. HARRISON, M.C. D.D.; J. T. BREWIS, B.A., B.D.; JOHN TELFORD, B.A.; F.W.H. ALLISON, A.R.I.B.A.; E. ROGERS, M.A., B.D.

OBITER DICTA THE EDITOR
PERIODICAL LITERATURE: BRITISH, AMERICAN, FOREIGN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

REV. J. SCOTT LIDGETT,
C.H., M.A., D.D.

Ex-Vice-Chancellor London University, Editor
Methodist Times, 1907-18, Joint Editor *Contemporary Review*. Warden: Bermondsey Settlement, President Uniting Methodist Conference.

REV. GEORGE JACKSON,
B.A., D.D.

Methodist Minister (Retired) Grasmere. Late Tutor, Didsbury College. Member of Literary Staff *Manchester Guardian*.

C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D.

Professor of Christian History, Mansfield College, Oxford.

REV. ERNEST B. STORR

Minister, Methodist Church, Clay Cross, Chesterfield. Writes excellent short stories.

MONTAGU FRANK MODDER,
M.A., Ph.D.

University of Michigan Ann Arbor (Department of English Language and Literature).

W. G. HANSON

Methodist Lay Preacher. Author: *The Message of Karl Barth*.

REV. DOUGLAS W. LOWIS, D.D.

Methodist Minister, Morecambe. Publications: *A Study in Medieval Christianity*, &c.

A. MARMORSTEIN, M.A., Ph.D.

Distinguished Rabbi and Author. Professor Jews' College, London.

J. A. LOVAT-FRASER, M.P.

National Labour Member of Parliament, Lichfield.

REV. WILLIAM F. LOFTHOUSE,
M.A., D.D.

Principal, Handsworth College, Birmingham. President Wesleyan Conference 1929. Publications: *The Father and the Son*, &c.

REV. R. NEWTON FLEW,
M.A., D.D.

The William Greenhalgh Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Wesley House, Cambridge. Member of Faculty, Board of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

REV. WILBERT F. HOWARD,
M.A., D.D.

The Lamplough Professor of New Testament Language and Literature and Classics, Handsworth College, Birmingham.

REV. ROGER B. LLOYD, M.A.

Vicar, Gt. Harwood, Blackburn. Publications: *The Stricken Lute, A Biography of Abelard*.

REV. HENRY BETT, M.A., Litt.D.

The Rank Chair of Pastoral Theology, Church History and Organization, and Resident Tutor, Handsworth College, Birmingham.

ATKINSON LEE, M.A.

Lecturer in Philosophy, Lecturer in Manchester University and Tutor, Hartley College, Manchester.

REV. NICHOLAS M. CUTHBERT

Minister, Methodist Church, Hunter Street, Chester.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

JULY, 1935

THE VENERABLE BEDE

IT is truly right and fitting that the twelve-hundredth anniversary of the passing of the Venerable Bede should be worthily celebrated in this country, not only by all branches of the Christian Church, but by all who are interested in the history, literature and intellectual progress of the English-speaking race. For in respect of all these Bede holds an exceptionally important place. In particular, but for his *Ecclesiastical History* scarcely any trustworthy records of the preceding period of English history would remain. His narrative, so careful, so unbiassed, and so touching in many of its descriptive details, was based upon laborious research, and remains the chief source of information for the entire period with which it deals.

Bede was born near Wearmouth in A.D. 673, entered the monastery there as a boy, and passed on to Jarrow as soon as the new monastery there was reared. Except for one brief visit to York and one or two trifling absences, he spent the whole of his life in these two monastic houses situated close to his birthplace. Bede died on Ascension Day, A.D. 735. In that year the Festival fell on May 26. The fact that he died on Ascension Day naturally sends us to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which shares with St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians the distinction of being the Epistle of the Ascension. The writer treats our Lord's incarnate life and His death as preparatory to the High Priestly activity upon which He entered fully at His Ascension. Our Lord, we are told, was 'made perfect through sufferings,' and in the twelfth chapter we are told that Christians, in coming unto Mount Sion, come 'unto the spirits of just men made perfect.'

It is well that in associating Bede with Ascensiontide we should reflect upon the meaning of this word 'perfect' as used by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is a great difference between the sense of the Greek word used and its translation by the Latin word 'perfect.' The Latin suggests something that is completely fashioned, and the meaning is therefore somewhat external and even mechanical in its significance. The Greek word (*τέλειωσις*), on the other hand, involves something vital and profoundly spiritual. It signifies a life that has completely attained its End, that has realized all the potentialities of the personality concerned; in character and achievement conditioned by full response to its fostering and corrective environment. Such inner and spiritual fulfilment is the needed preparation for entering into the full activities and blessedness of the heavenly life and realm. Of this perfecting the life of the Venerable Bede is an outstanding example.

In commemorating Bede it is necessary to see him in the setting of his age and environment. It was a period of ceaseless change, for the most part tumultuous, violent, and cruel. Shortly before his birth, North British Christianity, which owed its origin to the Irish missionaries, to Iona and to Holy Island, had given its adhesion to the Church of Rome, and Benedict Biscop, the Abbot of Wearmouth, had been active in promoting this eventful change. Yet Bede reverently and tenderly commemorated the services of Aidan, Columba, Cuthbert and others, upon whom Rome looked askance and treated almost as schismatics. Ceaseless changes took place in Northumbria through his life, many of them internal, but many more in regard to its position relative to Mercia and Wessex, in their continual and successive attempts to establish hegemony over Anglo-Saxon England. In addition to these constant struggles, successive wars were waged by Northumbria with Picts and Britons still unsubdued. No wonder that saints who sought the contemplative life and scholars who were devoted to learning sought the monastic

life as the only shelter for their devotions, their study, and their teaching. It was in the monasteries that the piety and learning which had been brought to the North of England from Ireland were preserved and enlarged.

It was in these troublous times but in this safe shelter that Bede arose, grew up, lived, wrought, and died. Scholar, teacher, saint, he was surrounded at Jarrow by six hundred monks, to whom he ministered as priest, and whom he instructed as teacher. Diligent in the onerous discharge of his priestly duties, he yet, by almost incredible self-discipline and industry, absorbed the entire available learning of his age, and imparted it to his school. His learning included Latin, Greek, and a tincture of Hebrew. He was versed in the science, music and poetry of his time. Indeed, his learning was encyclopaedic, and all of it was turned to practical account. Above all, he devoted himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures and to history, with great interest in biography. In all these directions his laborious inquiries bore momentous fruit. Notably in regard to history, he has left to posterity his priceless *Ecclesiastical History*, in biography his *Life of St. Cuthbert*. But his memory is at least equally important for his devotion to the work of commenting on the Scriptures and of translating the Psalms and the Gospel of St. John. Unhappily, these translations have long since perished, but his choice of the Fourth Gospel is significant of much, for that Gospel is one of the main sources of the great Catholic Creed of Nicaea, and presents the most highly developed Christology of the New Testament as the object of Christian faith.

By his labours on the Holy Scriptures Bede became the first great example of the outstanding feature of English Christianity—its characteristic endeavour to rest its faith not so much upon creeds and formal theology as upon the reverent study of the Holy Scriptures. In his last work—the translation of the Gospel according to St. John—Bede was occupied until the very moment of his death. The

account of his last day, given by his youthful amanuensis, is touching in the extreme. After taking leave of the monks and distributing his small possessions among them, we are told that ‘He passed the day joyfully till the evening; and the boy, above mentioned, said, “Dear Master, there is yet one sentence not written.”’ He answered, “Write quickly.” Soon after, the boy said, “The sentence is now written.” He replied, “It is well, you have said the truth. It is ended. Receive my head into your hands, for it is a great satisfaction to me to sit facing my holy place, where I was wont to pray, that I may also sitting call upon my Father.” And thus on the pavement of his little cell, singing “Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost,” when he had named the Holy Ghost he breathed his last, and so departed to the heavenly kingdom.’

Surely in all this the perfection of fulfilment is made manifest. And this, not merely in years and labour, or even in faith and character, but in the many-sided realization of all that true catholicity should mean, of the all-embracing interests of the Christian faith properly understood. Bede’s religion, while deeply personal, was truly catholic in its fellowship, its range, and its all-embracing concern. Devout, wide-minded and humane, everything was brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ and thus became duly proportioned and truly inspired. While sternly self-disciplined, Bede was habitually serene and joyous, as his habit of frequently bursting into the Doxology, with which he ended his life, amply shows. Not self-centred as a scholar, he shared all the wealth of his many-sided knowledge and experience with all those who were committed to his charge, imbuing them with his own sense of all the higher values of human life. Thus as scholar, teacher, and saint, the Venerable Bede gave a permanent impulse and direction to many-sided culture, firmly founded in religious faith. The memory of the successful men of his time, whether ecclesiastics, soldiers or men of affairs, has, for the most part, passed away, and at

best appeals to a limited few. But Bede still lives to teach and to inspire the Christian Church by the fidelity of his personal life and by the secure founding of his faith upon the Holy Scriptures. By his self-fulfilment in enduring service and in the pursuit of Art, Science and the Humanities he showed that all these are consonant with the spirit of the children of God and the servants of our Lord, who, as St. Paul tells us, 'ascended far above all the heavens that He might fill all things.' Such fulfilment in the calm and holy joy of 'reasonable service' does indeed supply a much needed lesson for the strenuous and distracted times in which we are living.

J. SCOTT LIDGETT.

JOHN WESLEY AS A BOOKMAN

THE world, even the Methodist world, is only slowly finding out how many-sided a man John Wesley was. It has never had any doubt about his greatness as an evangelist; it has received with readiness Macaulay's estimate of his genius for government as not inferior to that of Richelieu, and with enthusiasm Matthew Arnold's happy phrase about his 'genius for godliness.' But there are other aspects of his manifold activities which it has either ignored or has not yet been able to make up its mind about. It is of one of these that something will be said in the following pages. Wesley the bookman, it may be admitted at once, is a person of far less consequence than Wesley the man of God, Wesley the evangelist, or even Wesley the organizer; nevertheless, he must be taken into account in any final estimate of the man whose life and work have proved so large a factor in the life of our modern world. Fortunately for us, he himself has made it possible by the engaging frankness and fullness of the literary confessions which are to be found in his incomparable *Journal*, beyond which, for the purposes of this paper, I have not thought it necessary to go. Wesley was, of course, a bookman in a twofold sense—he was both a reader of books and a maker of them. It is with the former only that I am concerned here. And not only do I pass over everything which he wrote himself; among the books which he read and criticized are many—especially books belonging to the realm of controversial divinity—which have long since turned to peat, and interest the world of living men no more. Yet even so, in what remains, so stamped is it with Wesley's fresh and vivid mind, that there is enough and more than enough to show with what eager zest he walked both the highways and the byways of the great world of books.

I

All students of Wesley remember his warning against over-much reading addressed to the studious Joseph Benson: 'Beware you be not swallowed up in books; an ounce of love is worth a pound of knowledge.' And again: 'Many persons are in danger of reading too little; you are in danger of reading too much.' But most of his counsels on this matter are in quite a different vein:

'What has exceedingly hurt you in time past,' he wrote to John Trembath, one of his preachers, 'nay, and I fear to this day, is want of reading. I scarce ever knew a preacher read so little. And perhaps by neglecting it you have lost the taste of it. Hence your talent in preaching does not increase. It is just the same as it was seven years ago. It is lively but not deep; there is little variety; there is no compass of thought. Reading only can supply this, with meditation and daily prayer. You wrong yourself greatly by omitting this. You can never be a deep preacher without it any more than a thorough Christian. . . . Whether you like it or no, read and pray daily. It is for your life; there is no other way: else you will be a trifler all your days, and a pretty, superficial preacher. Do justice to your own soul; give it time and means to grow.'

Nor was Wesley content to give good advice; he took steps to make it practicable. His *Christian Library*—'Consisting of Extracts from, and Abridgements of, the Choicest Pieces of Practical Divinity which have been publish'd in the English Tongue'—in fifty volumes, issued at intervals from 1749 to 1755, shows how he toiled to put the best within the reach of all.

But Wesley's own example told more than all his precepts. Throughout his long life, like Browning's 'Grammarians,'

Fierce as a dragon
He (soul-hydroptic with a sacred thirst)
Sucked at the flagon.

In the first volume of Curnock's edition of the *Journal* most of a page is taken up with details of Wesley's reading in the interval between his ordination (September, 1725) and his election to the Fellowship of Lincoln (March 17, 1726). Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and English, theology, church

history, and works of devotion, history, science, poetry, and plays, all find a place in the long and varied list. Wesley was then a young student of three-and-twenty. If now we turn to the entries in the *Journal* sixty years later, we shall find the same eager mind still busily at work. Religion holds, of course, the first place, but references to Mills *On the Management of Bees*, Major Vallancey's *Irish Grammar*, Withering's *Treatise on Foxglove*, Dobbs's *Universal History*, Adams *On Electricity*, Keate's *Account of the Pelew Islands*, *The Life of Mrs. Bellamy*, and Edmund Burke—all the entries of an octogenarian—show how quick and varied were the old man's interests to the very end. The last book which Wesley read was *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa*, written by himself. He not only read the book, Curnock adds, on his way to his last service at Leatherhead, but it probably led him to write his last letter to Wilberforce against slavery, 'that execrable villainy, which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature.'

The last paragraph will have given some idea of the wide range of Wesley's bookish interests. It may be supplemented by the impression left by the reading of the *Journal* on the minds of two very different scholars of our own day—the one a Scot, the other an American. 'All kinds of people,' writes James Denney, 'turn up in his pages—Ephraim the Syrian and Dionysius the Areopagite, Calvin and Loyola, Episcopius and Baxter, Doddridge and Zinzendorf, Erskine's Sermons and Home's *Douglas*.' C. T. Winchester's note is similar in character but fuller in detail:

'Among the authors of classic rank whom he mentions in the *Journal*—and that not merely by a word of quotation or an incidental reference, but in a way to indicate that he was actually reading them at the time or had long been familiar with them—are Homer, Plato, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Anacreon; Lucian, Virgil, Cicero, Juvenal, Horace; Ariosto, Tasso; Voltaire, Rousseau; Shakespeare, Milton, Cowley, Dryden, Locke, Pope, Swift, Prior, Young, Thomson, Gray, Sterne, Johnson, Ossian. And this is by no means a complete list.'

Like every wise bookman, Wesley learned to relate some portion of his daily reading to the countries and districts into which his ceaseless journeyings took him. Thus in Scotland he read Knox's *History of the Reformation*, the spirit of which he found far too fierce for his liking, Johnson's *Journal of a Tour in the Hebrides*, written, he thought 'with admirable sense and great fidelity,' Pennant's *Tour in Scotland*, and Anderson's *Account of the Hebrides*. A much longer list might be compiled of books about Ireland which he read on his many Irish visits. Similarly, on one of his Cornish journeys, he writes:

'I looked over Mr. Borlase's *Antiquities of Cornwall*. He is a fine writer, and quite master of his subject, who has distinguished with amazing accuracy the ancient Saxon monuments from the more ancient Roman, and from those of the Druids, the most ancient of all.'

A judgement the generosity of which is the more marked since Borlase had shown the Methodists of his parish but scant respect.

This frequent fellowship with great writers kept Wesley's mind well aerated. 'To read nothing but the New Testament, and to think of nothing but the gospel,' it has been rightly said, 'induces a kind of spiritual feverishness which is not intellectually wholesome,' and which, it may be added, is one of the besetting ailments of the evangelist. Wesley was happily saved from this as well by his love of good books as by the grace given unto him. Is there any surer antidote to the narrowesses and pettinesses to which even the best of us are liable than daily contact with great literature?

II

As I have already indicated, Wesley read and wrote of many books which we have long since banished from our shelves. On the other hand, the reader of the *Journal* must sometimes wish that he had been less sparing in his comment on some of the great books which are always with us. We hardly needed his assurance that he 'read *Pilgrim's Progress*,'

but beyond the bare fact he tells us nothing. There are a few references to Milton, but again he tells us no more than that he prepared a selection of the poems for the Kingswood children and an 'Extract,' with notes, from the *Paradise Lost*. He read Pascal's *Thoughts*, but his only comment is the somewhat irrelevant question: 'What could possibly induce such a creature as Voltaire to give such an author as this a good word, unless it was that he once wrote a satire?' The note on Butler's *Analogy* is more to the point, but still leaves us asking for more: 'I doubt it is too hard for most of those for whom it is chiefly intended. *Freethinkers*, so called, are seldom *close thinkers*. They will not be at the pains of reading such a book as this.' And how we should have liked to hear more of Wesley's great contemporaries, Burke and Johnson! The former gets but bare mention, the allusions to the latter are tantalizing in their brevity. And what of Shakespeare? The quotations from him in the *Journal* are far fewer than from Horace, but, unfortunately, a sorry bit of vandalism on the part of one of Wesley's preachers, who, after his death, destroyed a quarto of the poet's works, 'the margins of which were filled with critical notes in Wesley's handwriting,' makes it impossible for us to answer the question with certainty.

My last examination of the book notices in the *Journal* brought out a fact which had escaped me before, and which I do not remember to have seen noted elsewhere, namely, that Wesley's blame of the books he is reading is both more frequent and more hearty than his praise. His was a very sensitive and critical mind, and he did not try to be patient with writers who took no pains to write correctly. 'He is doubtless,' he says of one unlucky scribe who came under his lash, 'a man both of sense and learning. Why has he then bad English in almost every page? No man should be above writing correctly.' Perhaps, too, Wesley's unceasing sense of responsibility to the multitudes who turned to him for guidance in matters both great and small sharpened his

natural acuteness in detecting and discovering whatever he counted unworthy. But, however we explain it, his general critical severity is, I think, beyond question.

III

These general references to Wesley as a bookman must now be supplemented by a few individual and more detailed examples of his literary judgements. They will illustrate what has just been said about his frequent severity, and at the same time will reveal to us some of his characteristics, both intellectual and moral. Wesley is very sure; his judgements are his own and not another man's, and he delivers them with a decisiveness which, it must be allowed, is sometimes suggestive of infallibility; and always it is the ethical interest which is dominant. Take, for example, this entry of June 19, 1776:

'Part of this week, I read, as I travelled, a famous book which I had not looked into for these fifty years. It was Lucian's *Dialogues*. He has a good deal of humour, but wonderful little judgement. His great hero is Diogenes the Cynic; just such another brute as himself. Socrates (as one might expect) he reviles and ridicules with all his might. I think there is more sense in his *Timon* than in all his other Dialogues put together; and even yet that ends poorly, in the dull jest of his breaking the heads of all that came near him. How amazing is it that such a book as this should be put into the hands of schoolboys!'

No less trenchant is he when he turns from literature to history and to the *Life of Alexander the Great*, by Q. Curtius:

'A fine writer, both as to thought and language. But what a hero does he describe! whose murder of his old friend and companion Clitus was a virtuous act in comparison of his butchering poor Philotas and his good old father, Parmenio. Yet even this was a little thing compared to the thousands and ten thousands he slaughtered, both in battle and in and after taking cities, for no other crime than defending their wives and children. I doubt whether Judas claims so hot a place in hell as Alexander the Great.'

His denunciation of Machiavelli is as calculated as it is comprehensive:

'My cool judgement is, that if all the other doctrines of devils which have been committed to writing since letters were in the world were collected together in one volume, it would fall short of this; and that, should a Prince form himself by this book, so calmly recommending hypocrisy, treachery, lying, robbery, oppression, adultery, whoredom, and murder of all kinds, Domitian or Nero would be an angel of light compared with that man.'

And yet when, some twenty years later, he read Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, he thought that the Englishman had outdone even Machiavelli:

'The Italian only recommends a few vices, as useful to some particular men and on some particular occasions. But the Englishman loves and cordially recommends vice of every kind; not only as useful now and then, but as absolutely necessary at all times for all communities! Surely Voltaire would hardly have said so much; and even Mr. Sandeman ("poor Mr. Sandeman," writes Denney, "who differed from Wesley about the definition of saving faith") could not have said more.'

Nor do religious writers fare much better at Wesley's hands when he thinks them in the wrong. 'I cannot but think,' he says of Swedenborg, 'the fever he had twenty years ago, when he supposes he was "introduced into the society of angels," really introduced him into the society of lunatics; but still,' he adds, relenting somewhat, 'there is something noble, even in his ravings.' Nor could all William Law's devotion to Jacob Behmen avail the German mystic aught in Wesley's eyes:

'The book I now opened was his *Mysterium Magnum*, or Exposition of Genesis. Being conscious of my ignorance, I earnestly besought God to enlighten my understanding. I seriously considered what I read, and endeavoured to weigh it in the balance of the sanctuary. And what can I say concerning the part I read? I can and must say thus much (and that with as full evidence as I can say that two and two make four), it is most sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled!'

The button is still off the foil when Wesley turns to some of the men of letters of his own land. Laurence Sterne was hardly likely to prove a writer after his heart, and this is what he thought of *A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy*:

'Sentimental! what is that? It is not English; he might as well say *Continental*. It is not sense. It conveys no determinate idea; yet one fool makes many. And this nonsensical word (who would believe it?) is become a fashionable one! However, the book agrees full well with the title, for one is as queer as the other. For oddity, uncouthness, and unlikeness to all the world beside, I suppose, the writer is without a rival.'

His dislike of Lord Chesterfield's *Letters* is even more hearty:

'What did I learn? That he was a man of much wit, middling sense, and some learning, but as absolutely void of virtue, as any Jew, Turk, or heathen that ever lived. . . . And this is the favourite of the age! Whereas, if he is rewarded according to his desert, his name will stink to all generations.'

Finally, what in its way could be better than this downright judgement of a German tract by Oettinger, the son-in-law of Bengel?

'I began reading with huge expectation . . . but how was I disappointed! So obscure a writer I scarcely ever saw before; I think he goes beyond Persius himself. When I had with huge labour read fifty or sixty pages, finding the sense did by no means make amends for the time and pains bestowed in searching it out, I took my leave of him for ever.'

Might not those of us who make a fetish of finishing every book we begin sometimes imitate Wesley's example to our own great advantage?

IV

It goes without saying that Wesley was sometimes badly 'out' in his estimate of books and writers. A man who read so much, and was so sure of himself, was certain some day to fall. When he alludes to Homer's 'pagan prejudices,' we do our best, out of respect to the great man, not to smile. But what can a French scholar think of his opinion of the French language? 'The French is the poorest, meanest language in Europe, no more comparable to the German or Spanish than a bag-pipe is to an organ. . . . It is as impossible to write a fine poem in French as to make fine-music on a jew's-harp.' Like Homer, Wesley had his 'prejudices.' Writing of one of the Popes, he says: 'He had many

excellent qualities; but was full as far from being a Christian as Henry VIII or Oliver Cromwell.' Cromwell! But then, we must remember, Wesley lived in the pre-Carlyle age.

Occasionally, too, like smaller men, Wesley lost his critical balance and over-praised the second-rate. To us to-day, who never open Young's *Night Thoughts*, it seems odd to find him carefully preparing an edition of that forgotten poem, 'leaving out the indifferent lines, correcting many of the rest, and explaining the hard words, in order to make that noble work more useful to all, and more intelligible to ordinary readers.' Again, he writes: 'What a poet was Ossian! Little inferior to either Virgil or Homer; in some respects superior to both.' And what shall we make of this?

'I read over a small book, *Poems*, by Miss Whateley, a farmer's daughter. She had little advantage from education, but an astonishing genius. Some of her elegies I think quite equal to Mr. Gray's. If she had had proper helps for a few years I question whether she would not have excelled any female poet that has ever yet appeared in England.'

Who was this 'Miss Whateley,' and where are her poems to-day? Even Nehemiah Curnock, the learned editor of the Standard Edition, can tell us nothing of either.

I have already quoted Wesley's vehement condemnation of Jacob Behmen. He is little less severe in his condemnation of the better known *Theologica Germanica*:

'Oh how was it that I could ever so admire the affected obscurity of this unscriptural writer! Glory be to God, that I now prefer the plain apostles and prophets before him and all his mystic followers!'

Even Luther, with whom he had so much in common, and to whom he owed so great a debt, he finds 'deeply tinctured with mysticism throughout, and hence often dangerously wrong.' Some will see in all this only the reaction of a robust, healthy soul against the weaknesses of a form of religion with which he had many affinities; to others it will suggest a blind spot on Wesley's retina. Happily, it is no part of my present task to decide between them.

V

Wesley's literary judgements, then, are always his own, they are unfailingly vivacious, and if sometimes they are as wrong as they are confident, there is no mistaking the general soundness of the principles which underlie them. Take, for example, what he regards as the essentials of a good English style. Of one writer he says: 'I cannot admire his style at all. It is prim, affected, and highly frenchified,' while of another he says: 'His language is remarkably clear, unaffected, nervous, and elegant.' He hated the florid, the obscure, and the prolix, as indeed his own spare, lucid style might lead us to expect. He was, in particular, impatient of those who—to adapt his own words—when they have made a pertinent remark know not when to have done with it, but spin it out without any pity for the reader. Here is one example out of many—a brief criticism of Fénelon's *Telemachus*:

'Certainly it is wrote with admirable sense. But is it without fault? Is there not abundantly too much machinery? Are not the gods (such as they are) continually introduced without why or wherefore? And is not the work spun out too long; drawn into mere French wire? Would not twelve books have contained all the matter much better than four-and-twenty?'

But Wesley's judgements on books and writers reveal higher qualities than a right understanding of the essentials of style. His moral trenchancy is illustrated in some of the quotations which have already been given. Wesley, as Denney pertinently remarks, was not one of those who make the intellectual experiment of seeing how much can be said for the wrong side. But of this I must leave the extracts to speak for themselves, choosing for a final word Wesley's really remarkable catholicity of mind which complemented and tempered its sharp incisiveness.

'I would recommend very few novels to young persons,' Wesley wrote to a correspondent, 'for fear they should be too desirous of more.' Yet he took pains to abridge, for the

use of a wider circle of readers, Brooke's *Fool of Quality*, a novel in five volumes. When Home's *Douglas*—a play written by a minister of the Scottish Kirk, and shown in Edinburgh—set all Scotland buzzing with excitement and got its author into serious trouble, Wesley read the play, and while regretting that a few lines had not been left out, 'was astonished to find it one of the finest tragedies I ever read.' A note on a foreign tract, *A Dialogue between Moses and Lord Bolingbroke*, by a certain Dr. Pye, is in the well-known 'think and let think' manner:

'Is it well thus to run down all that differ from us? Dr. Pye is an ingenious man; but so is Dr. Robinson also. So are twenty more, although they understand Moses in a quite different manner.'

Richard Baxter's *Life* and Neal's *History of the Puritans* both showed him that the faults were not all on one side in the fierce struggles of that day: 'In spite of all the prejudices of education, I could not but see that the poor Nonconformists had been used without either justice or mercy,' while at the same time he regretted that so many of them 'spent so much of their time and strength in disputing about surplices and hoods, or kneeling at the Lord's Supper.'

Wesley had scant sympathy with much of the teaching of the Quakers. He thought Barclay's *Apology* a 'solemn trifile'; he called George Fox's *Great Mystery* 'that medley of nonsense, blasphemy, and scurrility.' Yet when he read the *Journal of William Edmundson*, a Quaker preacher of the seventeenth century, his whole heart went out to him:

'If the original equalled the picture (which I see no reason to doubt) what an amiable man was this! His opinions I leave; but what a spirit was here! What faith, love, gentleness, long-suffering! Could mistake send such a man as this to hell? Not so. I am so far from believing this that I scruple not to say, "Let my soul be with the soul of William Edmundson!"'

In like fashion spiritual kinship could find a way for Wesley across the far wider gulf that divided him from Roman Catholicism. In all Great Britain he knew no man,

except Fletcher of Madeley, worthy to stand, in the saintliness of his character, by the side of Gregory Lopez or M. de Renty. Of the religious leaders of the past, there were few perhaps with whom Wesley felt himself in more real accord than Richard Baxter. 'In how different a manner does this man write'—so runs the entry in the *Journal*, after he had finished some dissenting minister's bitter book—'from honest Richard Baxter! The one dipping, as it were, his pen in tears, the other in vinegar and gall. Surely one page of that loving, serious Christian weighs more than volumes of this bitter, sarcastic jester.'

How can I better conclude this note on Wesley's catholicity than with the familiar and oft-quoted words concerning Marcus Aurelius?

'What a strange emperor! And what a strange heathen! Giving thanks to God for all the good things he enjoyed! In particular, for His good inspiration, and for twice revealing to him in dreams things whereby he was cured of (otherwise) incurable distempers. I make no doubt but this is one of those "many" who "shall come from the east and the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," while "the children of the kingdom," nominal Christians, are "shut out."

GEORGE JACKSON.

FOOTNOTE

I must not conclude this paper without paying tribute once more to Nehemiah Curnock's eight-volume Standard Edition of Wesley's *Journal*. I do not know any worthier edition of a great English classic. My own task has been immensely simplified by the fullness and accuracy of the index which, in the scores of references I have made with its aid, I have never once found at fault. On the special subject of my paper I have seen nothing beyond the brief treatment which it receives in some of the Lives of Wesley, and an admirable article by the late Professor James Denney in the old and long since defunct *United Free Church Magazine*.

DR. KLAUSNER'S ESTIMATE OF JESUS

IT is proverbially a good thing sometimes 'to see oursels as ithers see us.' When therefore a fair-minded Jewish scholar writes about Christianity, common sense demands that Christians should pay respectful attention to what he says. The claim may perhaps be made for them that this indeed is what they do. The works of Montefiore and Abrahams on the Gospels have been very widely read by Christian students, and Dr. Joseph Klausner's life of Jesus¹ has also had a good reception and a wide circulation in this country and America. A second edition of the German translation has appeared.

While aware that his book would evoke much adverse criticism, Dr. Klausner made it his aim to write objectively and fairly, and his efforts to achieve this aim are visible throughout the book. Chapter and verse are given for every statement of fact on which an expression of opinion is based, so that, even when the reader differs from the opinions expressed, he is conscious that Dr. Klausner has honestly striven to be just. The book, of course, is marked by strongly patriotic Jewish feeling, and at one point the author seems to be tacitly assuming that no Christian *can* judge fairly between Jesus and His Jewish contemporaries,² forgetting that this is a very double-edged argument. Yet on the whole his case is very temperately stated; and wherever he feels he can praise the One of whom he writes, he does so generously. Add to this the fact that he writes with an unrivalled knowledge of Rabbinic literature, and it becomes clear that his study of the life of Jesus is a book with which all serious students of the Gospels must reckon.

¹ *Jesus of Nazareth : His life, times, and teaching.* By Joseph Klausner, Ph.D. Translated from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby, D.D. (London, Allen & Unwin, 1925 and 1927. My references are to the 1925 edition).

² Of F. Delitzsch he says (p. 224 n. 99) that 'for him, a Christian believer, an unbiased attitude was impossible.' Cf. pp. 9-12.

Notwithstanding what he says about the difficulty of Christians being unbiassed in their estimate of Jesus, Dr. Klausner would not, we feel sure, object to their saying courteously and frankly where they feel that he has been inconsistent or historically inaccurate or otherwise mistaken in the judgements he expresses.

I

The injunctions of the Jewish Law concerned the Jew's relations with his fellow-men (what we normally understand as *morals*) and his attitude to God (the specifically *religious* concerns of prayer, worship, &c.). The code in which they were enshrined was the Pentateuch; the rest of the Old Testament served as a quarry for interpretative ideas. The outstanding feature of the Pharisaic Judaism of Jesus' day was an immense elaboration of a number of the Pentateuchal commandments, so as to show how they would apply in practice to every conceivable situation that might arise. The tangible results of this extension of the written word of Scripture are seen in the Mishnah (compiled about A.D. 200), of which Dr. Klausner's translator has recently published a complete English version.¹ Here we have a stout volume of nearly 800 large, closely-printed pages, dealing almost entirely, not with either religion or morals as commonly understood, but with the observances thought necessary as the expression of a right relationship to God and man. Individual prescriptions of the Pentateuch (those, for example, securing to the poor the right to glean, enjoining the payment of tithes, forbidding two kinds of seed to be sown in the same field, and so on, and so on) are elaborated into sixty-three ample tractates, in which the opinions of Jewish Rabbis on the *minutest* details involved in obedience to the prescription in question, are carefully recorded. It would be

¹ *The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with introduction and brief explanatory notes.* By Herbert Danby, D.D. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.)

impossible to exaggerate the amount of hair-splitting and triviality incorporated in the book; and any reader who questions the justice of this characterization must be referred to the book itself for the grounds of it. In the third and following centuries A.D. the Mishnah, vast as it already was, was lovingly elaborated into the still vaster Talmud, the capital achievement of Rabbinic scholarship. Our immediate concern, however, is not with what followed, but with what preceded, the composition of the Mishnah. It embodied at least two earlier written codes made in the course of the second century; and even these must have been preceded by a long period of oral transmission: in fact, about forty-five out of some 160 Rabbis who are quoted or referred to in the Mishnah belong to the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 80. While, therefore, we must heed Dr. Klausner's warning (pp. 131-134) against ignoring the chronology of Rabbinic writings, and over-generalizing what belongs perhaps only to a special period,¹ there can be no reasonable doubt that, in the time of Jesus, Pharisaism was already well-launched on that path of meticulous casuistry over the minutiae of legal observance which led in time to the full Talmudic legislation. The references in the Gospels, therefore, to tithing mint, anise, and cummin, loading men with burdens grievous to be borne, broadening phylacteries and quibbling over the validity of this oath and that, are perfectly true to history.

Dr. Klausner seems to consider it a merit of this system that it did not confine itself to ethico-religious ideas, but aimed at embracing the whole of life (pp. 371-373, 395f, 406). This excuses, he thinks, because it necessarily involved, the far-fetched definition, the hair-splitting, and even the discussion of unseemly subjects, which characterized the teaching of the Rabbis, who had to be lawyers, magistrates, notaries, physicians, agriculturalists, &c., as well as moral and religious teachers (pp. 372f).

¹ Cf. Dr. E. R. Bevan's remarks in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. IX, pp. 412f.

But admitting for the sake of argument the moral value of a system of casuistry as an aid to right living, and the necessity of complex rules for the settlement of the innumerable legal questions which practical life throws up,¹ we are still far from having to acknowledge the necessity of such scrupulosity as pervaded Rabbinism. 'From what time in the morning may the *Shema'* be recited? So soon as one can distinguish between blue and white. Rabbi Eliezer says, "Between blue and green".' When blessing God 'over vegetables a man says, ". . . who createst the fruit of the ground"; but Rabbi Judah says, ". . . who createst divers kinds of herbs".' 'How much should one' (in a company) 'eat to make up the number needed for the Common Grace? An olive's bulk. Rabbi Judah says, "An egg's bulk".' 'If a man would lop off the leaves of vegetables to lighten his load, he should not throw them away until he has given tithe of them.' A legislation which thought it important to enact by the hundred rules of this type is clearly no healthy guide to life.

Praise in the common things of life,
Its goings out and in;
Praise in each duty and each deed,
However small and mean.

Yes: but when it comes to spending time and ink in prescribing in detail how, as a matter of religious obligation, the most trivial and morally most indifferent performances are to be carried out, and the different views of different Rabbis on the question, the result is not a sanctification of common life (p. 226), but a sad travesty of true religion and true morals.

Dr. Klausner himself to some extent admits the justice of this criticism. He acknowledges 'that Pharisaism did, in truth, contain one serious defect which enabled the more hypocritical to pride themselves in the mere performance of the commandments.' This defect consisted essentially

¹ Cf. Dr. Bevan's apologia in the *Camb. Ancient Hist.* vol. IX, pp. 416f.

in the assignment of greater importance to religious duties owed towards God (by which Dr. Klausner means virtually the detailed ceremonial observances) than to the ethical duties owed to one's fellow-men (pp. 215f; cf. pp. 220, 226, 321, 322, 371). 'The Pharisees and the *Tannaim*—even the earliest of them—did, indeed, "pile up the measure" of the ceremonial laws, and they so overlaid the original nucleus with a multiplicity of detail and minutiae as unwittingly to obscure the divine purpose of these laws' (p. 371). He adduces one instance of a trifling sacrificial detail, about which the dispute was prolonged for generations (p. 220), and tells how the great Shammai 'took vast pains over the question of vetches in the Second Tithe' (p. 321; cf. p. 227) and how Hillel—an older contemporary of Jesus, and a Pharisee of the best type—asserted that 'No am-ha-aretz' (i.e. working man of humble rank) 'can be a pious man' (p. 276). He contends indeed that this grave defect was recognized and condemned by the best elements in Pharisaism, and quotes for the purpose an ancient Talmudic passage in which certain objectionable types of Pharisees (including hypocrites and extremists) are condemned (pp. 213f, 215f, 227, 321). But the perusal of a few pages of the Mishnah will suffice to convince us that, whatever this obscure Talmudic passage may have meant, neither the best nor any other type of Pharisaism in Jesus' day put up any sort of a fight against the absorption of the Pharisaic mind in the most meticulous trivialities as if they were matters of religious importance. And if this be the case—and I do not understand Dr. Klausner seriously to deny it—what becomes of the argument that all this solemn trifling possessed immense value as bringing religion into touch with every phase of practical life?

II

But Dr. Klausner has another plea to advance in defence of Rabbinic teaching. This highly specialized legalism was a *national* possession and a *national* characteristic. Pure

morals and pure religion are the same for all peoples, and cannot therefore furnish anything distinctive of any one people. It was only the peculiar ceremonialism of the Rabbis which stamped the Jews as distinct from other nations and which, by keeping them separate from the rest of the world, enabled them to give the world their own distinctive religious message (pp. 224f, 226f, 371-376, 390f, 405f).

Now it is natural enough that a strongly self-conscious nation should take a pride in its national characteristics; and up to a point such pride is harmless and even good. But it does not follow that national peculiarities *as such* are necessarily good and worth preserving for their own sake. National characteristics, as reflected in established customs, are sometimes degrading and evil. In the case before us, we must surely say that the Rabbinic custom of niggling casuistry, carried as it was to the *n*th degree, is very far from being a real ornament of the Jewish race; and one cannot readily see why the national distinctness of Judaism was, in point of fact, so dependent upon it as Dr. Klausner supposes. And we have, I think, to ask the further question whether insistence on national distinctness has not been as much a bane to humanity as a blessing. By insisting over much on their peculiar national usages the Jews may or may not have been doing what was essential to their national survival: but at any rate they erected such a barrier between themselves and the Gentile world as largely alienated Gentile sympathy and rendered ineffective the service they were otherwise so well fitted to render. Dr. Klausner rightly claims that the interests of Judaism were also ultimately the interests of the world at large (p. 390): but this identity of interests surely sprang, not from the Rabbinic teaching, but from the lofty monotheism and earnest prophetic ethics of Judaism; and he very handsomely admits that, when Judaism became in this sense 'a light to the Gentiles,' it did so 'through the medium of Christianity' (p. 406). Precisely so: it was only by *transcending* the narrow nationalism

of the Jew that the followers of Jesus were able to put the treasures of Judaism within the reach of the wider world. By concentrating on the maintenance of national characteristics and privileges, and so accentuating the antagonism between himself and the Gentile, the Jew, as Dr. Gwatkin has quite rightly said, 'renounced his duty to the world just when his training for it was completed.'¹

III

Dr. Klausner's treatment of the attitude of Jesus to Pharisaic legalism betrays the same apparent inconsistency as does his own attitude to it. Seeing that that legalism embraced the whole of practical life and was a treasured national possession, he adversely criticizes Jesus for having ignored or opposed, or undermined it, in the interests of a universal morality and a certain conception of God (pp. 224f, 371f, 376, 390f). In particular, he thinks Jesus was unfair in accusing the Pharisees en masse of what were the faults of only a few (pp. 321f); and makes the perfectly just claim that Judaism 'should be judged by the best that it contains and not by the worst' (p. 215). Yet he himself provides us with the refutation of his own arguments on the particular question at issue. He admits, to begin with, that Jesus did not, in point of fact, wholly ignore or set aside the ceremonial law. He kept much of it Himself, wearing the ceremonial tassels on His cloak, sending the healed leper to the priests, paying the temple tax, and so forth (pp. 304, 319f, 363f, 371f, 413).² What He opposed

¹ *Early Church History*, vol. I, p. 18.

² It should, however, be noted that the words 'These things ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other' (i.e. the ceremonial minutiae) 'undone' (Matt. xxiii. 23; or Luke xi. 42), which Dr. Klausner (pp. 322, 367) and Dr. Bevan (*Camb. Ancient History*, vol. IX, p. 416) both quote as proving that Jesus did not intend to annul the ceremonial law, are absent from the Lucan passage in Codex Bezae, and probably therefore no part of the original text of Luke, but an interpolation from Matthew. Instead, therefore, of accepting them as historical on the ground that they come from Q, we must treat them as a legalistic interpolation on the part of the author of 'Matthew.'

and condemned were the trivialities and externalisms which threatened to obscure the real religious and moral interests at stake; and He was quite right in opposing and condemning them (pp. 215f, 220, 321f, 371 bott., 373 top). But ample evidence has already been adduced to show that it was not the extremists only among the Pharisees, but the Pharisees *as a body*, who were tainted with the craze of elaborating the minutiae of the Law. It is certainly true, as Dr. Klausner points out, that there was much in the genuine religiousness of the Pharisees with which Jesus could and did sympathize, that there were many of them with whom He was personally on friendly terms, and that there were features common to His style of teaching and to theirs (e.g. pp. 319f, 363ff, 413). Yet all this does not alter the fact that the Pharisees *as a body* had already begun to lapse steadily into a habit of hair-splitting, niggling, and logic-chopping over observances religiously and morally indifferent, and that this habit spelt the defeat of the genuine religious interests entrusted to Israel for the sake of the world. If it be granted that Jesus was justified in denouncing Pharisaic triviality, the existence of the Mishnah is sufficient proof that He was justified in denouncing Pharisaism in general.

IV

But the complaint that Jesus ignored or undermined a valuable national possession broadens out into a deeper and wider accusation. Jesus, Dr. Klausner thinks, cared little or nothing for His nation. 'The rest of mankind was everything to Jesus, but his own people, the national group, was nothing at all to him' (p. 225). His 'thoughts turned not on his people's future.' He wished to 'reform the world¹ . . . by the inner reformation of the *individual*' (pp. 236f).

¹ I do not know how this assertion is to be reconciled with the statement on p. 397: 'He cared not for reforming the world or civilisation.'

His Kingdom was otherworldly¹ and non-political: He lacked the political interest and vision of the great prophets (pp. 236, 372f, 376, 390, 396f, 410, 414); and therefore, naturally and rightly, the Jewish people rejected Him (pp. 376, 397, 414).

Now it appears that by possessing a political interest Dr. Klausner means in the main a willingness to sanction armed rebellion against the Roman yoke. Only by such an assumption can I reconcile the statements just summarized with other passages which seem at first sight inconsistent with them. Thus, 'Jesus was . . . truly Jewish in everything pertaining to the belief in *a worldly and even a political Messiah*,² the only difference was that, as against the believers in a political Messiah, he supposed that only with the help of God, *without the help of armed force*, he should restore the Kingdom of Israel to the Jews when once they should repent' (p. 402). At all events Dr. Klausner alludes several times to Jesus' failure to advocate revolt against Rome as apparently a grave defect in His teaching (cf. pp. 236f, 393, 403, 406).³ His advice to give tribute to Caesar cost Him His popularity because it 'proved to the people that not from this Galilaean Messiah could they hope for national freedom and political redemption' (p. 318; cf. p. 373). As illustrating the superiority of the Jewish Law-book to the ethics of Jesus, Dr. Klausner actually adduces (alongside of injunctions of gentleness and forgiveness) such of its phrases as: 'Remember

¹ So pp. 236, 405. It must, however, be stated that John xviii. 36 ('My Kingdom is not of this world,' &c.), having purely Johannine attestation, ought not to be quoted off-hand as a real utterance on the part of the historical Jesus.

² Cf. with this the words on p. 237: 'Jesus, who was one of the people and lived among them, knew their distress and believed too in the prophetic promises and consolations, certainly meditated much on present conditions, and his imagination pictured for him in glowing colours the *redemption, both political and spiritual*.' [Italics here and in the text are mine.]

³ Here again we stumble on another of Dr. Klausner's inconsistencies. Hillel, the beau-ideal of Pharisaism, whom Dr. Klausner contrasts with the extreme and impracticable Jesus, was also, like Jesus, 'no fighter nor politician' (p. 396).

what Amalek did unto thee,' 'Harass the Midianites,' 'Thou shalt not leave a soul alive,' and 'The Book of Esther describing in most garish colours the vengeance wreaked on the enemy. All such feelings and attitudes,' he says, 'exist within a people and must find place in its literature: they are all human, deeply implanted in man's nature and they may not be changed in a moment at will' (p. 396).

We rub our eyes, and ask: Does Dr. Klausner seriously argue that Jesus would have done better and have had a stronger claim on the regard of His fellow-countrymen, if He had forbidden the payment of tribute to Caesar and had led an armed revolt against Caesar's rule? So indeed it seems. Yet is it not perfectly obvious that, had He done so, and been listened to, He would have dealt a fatal blow at the national well-being? The Jews withheld tribute and revolted in A.D. 66, with the result that Palestine was deluged with the blood of over a million Jews, Jerusalem was sacked, and the Temple burned. One would have thought that to warn the people against incurring so terrific a calamity and to induce them to avoid incurring it was a mark, not of impracticable idealism and unpatriotic otherworldliness, but of national usefulness and sound political judgement.

I would, indeed, claim that Jesus, so far from being uninterested in the welfare of His nation and unconcerned over her political future, made a great deal of the political implications of His ethical teaching. It is inherently almost incredible that He should not have done so. He believed Himself to be the Messiah: that of itself stamps His life-rôle as a *national* one. When on trial for His life, He told Pilate He was the King of the Jews; and we may well ask, with the author of *Ecce Homo*: 'Did He die for a metaphor?' The Kingdom He announced was to be a kingdom *on earth* (so the Lord's Prayer); and He did not at first expect that His fellow-countrymen would reject Him (otherwise, why His obvious disappointment when they did so?). Can He therefore have left out of account the burning political

question that was challenging every intelligent Jew—the question, namely, as to the relation between Israel and Rome? Surely not. That question is then the background against which we have to read and interpret such passages as Matt. iv. 8–10, v. 38–48, xi. 20–24, xxii. 15–22, xxiv. 1–2 and their parallels, and Luke xii. 54–xiii. 9, xix. 41–44, xxiii. 27–31. Let the reader only be at pains to turn up these few passages, and then ask himself whether they do not make it abundantly clear that Jesus foresaw and feared the danger of a struggle with Rome, and exerted Himself to the utmost to induce His fellow-countrymen to steer clear of it, not by a negative submission only, but by a positive ethic of forgiveness, reconciliation, and love. To advocate a peace-policy of that kind was not to ignore the nation's interests or show oneself devoid of political vision: it was rather to point the nation to the one way of true righteousness and true wisdom. The fact that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom as being supernaturally set up by the sovereign power of God did not at all imply (as modern scholars have been too ready to infer) that there was nothing for men to do in the matter of making it a reality on earth: Divine initiative and intervention by no means exclude human agency—rather the reverse. And the same narrow nationalism which crucified Jesus ended in involving the nation in the shambles of A.D. 66–70. Would Jesus really have been wiser and more patriotic and more deserving of Jewish support if—simply because a yearning and readiness for bloody revenge actually existed in the human hearts around Him—He had given His approval to these passions, and led an armed revolt in order to liberate Israel from the Roman yoke?

V

Dr. Klausner, like many other students of the Gospels, is put off by the rigorous idealism of Jesus' ethical teaching. He quotes the familiar words in which Jesus deprecates the laborious pursuit of wealth, discourages men from forcibly

resisting and suing at law those who wrong them, forbids swearing and divorce, and praises those who make themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake (pp. 373-376, 393f); and he draws the inference that He was indifferent to all material civilization and culture, to the administration of public justice, and to the needs of family life. 'Where there is no call for the enactment of laws, for justice, for national statecraft, where belief in God and the practice of an extreme and one-sided ethic is in itself enough—there we have the negation of national life and of the national state' (p. 374). By 'unduly' emphasizing the Jewish ideal of love and forgiveness, Jesus made demands which only a few were capable of obeying: their validity depended on the reality of the expected Messianic utopia. Unlike the demands of Judaism, which were practicable for all and sundry, the demands of Jesus were so ideal as to be impracticable for ordinary life and therefore useless for the nation and for society, both in our day and in His (pp. 392f, 395-397, 405, 414).

Now if we are to estimate this aspect of Jesus' teaching aright, we must first of all distinguish between injunctions incidental to some temporary phase of His mission and injunctions rooted in His whole outlook on life and thus permanent and essential elements of His teaching. His commendation, for instance, of those who abstain from marriage for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake (Matt. xix. 12) cannot rightly be treated as a general exhortation to celibacy; and His description (reported in the immediate context) of the married as those whom God had joined together, is a sufficient proof that it cannot. He clearly had in mind only those who, under the special stress or demand of a particular situation, forewent the comforts of married life. Similarly with His teaching about property: His requirement of the rich young ruler probably had reference to the immediate needs of the Palestinian mission. The words about the ravens and the lilies deprecate not work, nor thought, but

worry: the argument is of the *a fortiori* pattern (as it is so frequently in the Gospels):—if God feeds and clothes the birds and the flowers (who do not labour), how much more will He feed and clothe you (who do)! When, however, we turn to what is usually (though not very aptly) called His non-resistance teaching, we find that He bases it, not on belief in the proximity of the Messianic Kingdom, but on belief in the nature of God Himself—‘in order that ye may become sons of your Father in Heaven, who raises His sun on evil and good men alike, and rains upon righteous and unrighteous.’ In the same way, the prohibitions of swearing and of divorce are based, not on any temporary conditions, but on great permanent realities.

We may readily concede the plea that only a comparatively few persons are ethically ready to comply with so exalted a standard of conduct: in that limited sense, *and in that only*, the standard may be pronounced impracticable. But it still remains true that what the many are unprepared to do at present, they may very wisely be prepared and encouraged to do in the future. And if such encouragement and preparation be wise, the insistent ethical teaching and the multiplying personal example needful therefore must also be wise and right. This distinction between (a) what is possible at once for the bulk of mankind, and (b) what it is wise and right to advocate by teaching and example, is often overlooked. Dr. Klausner overlooks it, and as a result of so doing pronounces Jesus’ teaching ‘no ethical code for the nations and the social order of to-day.’ The only real objection to this teaching is that many men will not obey it: but that is their fault, not the fault of the Teacher. Some men *are* prepared to obey it; and in proportion as they learn from Jesus to be able to forgive wrongs, to overcome evil with good, not to worry about the future, not to be grasping and covetous, to be truthful in their speech, and patient, self-controlled, and reverent in the marriage-relationship—to that degree do they become socially and politically

constructive. In proportion as they distrust and disobey this teaching, they minister to social disintegration and political calamity. We may even say that social progress itself depends on the multiplication of the obedient, and the diminution of the disobedient. That the bulk of humanity are at present unready and unwilling to obey it, is true: but that the Teacher was therefore unwise in giving it, that those who obey it have to make themselves recluses, and that obedience to it by a growing number of persons means the negation of national life and the loss of political and cultural values—is most emphatically not true.

VI

Apart from his failure to perceive the far-sighted political wisdom enshrined in the ethic of Jesus, Dr. Klausner labours under some extraordinary misconceptions in the exegesis of particular passages. Commenting on the well-known command to love one's enemies, because God makes His sun rise on evil and good men alike, and sends His rain on the just and the unjust, he draws the following inferences: 'sinners and non-sinners, evil and good, ungodly and righteous, all alike are of the same worth in God's sight. It follows, therefore, that God is not *absolute righteousness* . . . He is not the God of justice . . . ; in other words, *he is not the God of History*' (p. 379). Now it is doubtless true that Jesus did not provide an intellectual synthesis of the punitive activities of God (which elsewhere He fully recognizes) and God's compassionate activities: no one, indeed, Jew or Gentile, has (so far as I know) yet succeeded in doing so. But is that any reason for quarrelling with His allusion to the impartial beneficence of Nature as a manifestation of God's care for all, including the unworthy? Indifference to sin is not necessarily involved in benevolence to the sinner, and that benevolence is all that Jesus here has in mind. Dr. Klausner, though noting that forgiveness of wrongs is approved in the Jewish Law (pp. 392f, 396f), seems totally

unable to see that a loving and self-sacrificing humility may well be, not indifference to sin, but the most God-like and effective reaction to it.

With questionable consistency, Jesus is censured, not only for representing God as not dealing harshly enough with sin, but also for dealing with it Himself too harshly. Let us admit that Jesus' words to the Phoenician woman (p. 294) reflect rather His sentiments as a born Jew than the universalism implicit in His message as a whole (though strangely enough Dr. Klausner does not praise Him for this manifestation of national loyalty): and let us provisionally admit the same of the words: 'Give not what is holy to the dogs,' &c. (pp. 394f), though in this case, as the passage has only Matthaean attestation, its historical accuracy cannot be taken as established beyond question. But it is really absurd to speak of Jesus 'cursing' the cities that did not repent, and solemnly to contrast His bitterness on this occasion with the forgiving spirit He inculcated at other times (pp. 288, 295, 410). When Jesus said: 'Woe to the pregnant and to those that give suck in those days' (Matt. xxiv. 19), was He cursing and showing a bitter, unforgiving spirit to the poor women He had in mind? To say 'Woe' is not to curse; it is to prophesy calamity. It does not necessarily express censure, as Matt. xxiv. 19 clearly shows. But even when it does express censure, as when addressed to the cities, it is not the same as cursing. I suggest that by being 'thrust down to Hades,' Jesus means the death-dealing Roman conquest which He foresaw would sooner or later overtake the population of these and other cities, if the nation should finally reject His pacific counsels.

Dr. Klausner's exegetical insight is similarly defective when he characterizes sayings like, 'Think not that I came to bring peace,' &c., and 'I came to cast fire on the earth,' &c. as harsh. Has he forgotten that the semi-deterministic speech of the Semitic oriental does not distinguish as clearly as we desire to between deliberately intended purpose and

foreseen result? In the passages quoted, Jesus is simply referring to the division and strife which He *foresaw* would arise between His disciples and their fellows. Was He 'harsh' because He inaugurated a movement which created sharp dissension between its supporters and its opponents?¹

Let us say in conclusion, then, that Dr. Klausner has given us an extraordinarily valuable study of the life of Jesus. He has enabled us to know all that can be said, from the side of Rabbinic Judaism, in criticism of Him. He helpfully illustrates from Rabbinic sources a great many of the statements made about and by Jesus in the Gospels. His cordial appreciation of certain phases of Jesus' life and work deserve to be warmly recognized and welcomed by Christian readers. But his main adverse criticisms, it must be maintained, all rest on misconceptions. His formulation of them, as we have seen, involves not a few inconsistencies with his own statements; and even where he is self-consistent, his confident strictures on Jesus' wisdom and nobility are unjustified when we examine them in the light of the actual facts of the case.

C. J. CADOUX.

¹ I note briefly here a few other critical judgements of Dr. Klausner which seem to me to be plainly erroneous:—that John's message from the prison (narrated in Q), because not recorded by Mark, is unhistorical (p. 249); that the phrase 'taught them as one having authority' is probably an error for 'taught them as one using parables' (pp. 264f; on this cf. T. W. Manson, *Teaching of Jesus*, p. 106 n.1); that had Jesus said He would rise again on the third day (meaning after a short indefinite interval), and then actually risen on the third day (taken literally), it would have been 'a coincidence, amounting to a miracle' (p. 301); that Jesus could not have said: 'let him deny himself and take up his cross' (p. 302), as if Galileans were not perfectly familiar with punishment by crucifixion; and that the healing of the centurion's servant (narrated in Q), because not recorded by Mark, 'is therefore of dubious authenticity' (p. 304 n.9).

SHAKESPEARE'S BRUTUS: A CHARACTER STUDY

IN the tragedy that bears his name Julius Cæsar is the historically greatest figure, and his death marks the dramatic climax to which all previous events lead and from which all subsequent events flow. The inception and development of the plot against the envied Cæsar, its execution in his murder, and its reactions of defeat and death on the leading conspirators—this series of rapid and thrilling happenings provides the material of the play. But its real interest is psychological. The supreme figure is Marcus Brutus, and the real drama is that which takes place in his soul. Amid the exciting movement of events we may trace the gradual unveiling of his character in its strength and its weakness, and watch the determining of his actions by the interplay of external influences and his own idealistic nature.

Other figures have interest too. Cassius, Antony, Portia, Calphurnia—each has a distinct individuality and is well worth study. But Brutus dominates the scene. While Cæsar passes off the stage in the third Act, only to reappear for a moment as a ghost, and all the other characters flit in and out, the play opens, after a purely introductory scene, with Brutus's first intimation of disaffection, and closes with his death and Mark Antony's eloquent tribute to him. *Julius Cæsar* is the moral history of Marcus Brutus during the testing period covered by its events.

Dante places Brutus in the lowest circle of hell, along with Judas Iscariot and Cassius. Shakespeare puts a halo of moral idealism around his treachery. Probably the Italian was nearer the historical truth. But it is a matter of no importance whether Shakespeare's Brutus was historical or not. If the drama in his soul was purely the creation of the poet's genius it is no less significant as a study in human nature; and the problems it raises belong to the twentieth century A.D. as truly as to the first century B.C.

The government of Rome had been for centuries republican. Julius Cæsar, by his victories against Pompey and the Senate, had now become a virtual dictator. The Roman people had conferred on him the highest offices in the State. Although no change had yet been made in the Constitution many began to fear it. The man whose word was that of a king became the target of jealous intrigue. That is the price that genius ever has to pay when its essential greatness is coming to be recognized. A little clique of envious men, led by Cassius, plotted great Cæsar's death.

Cassius was well fitted for his office of arch-conspirator. Gleams of nobleness appear, here and there, in his character, redeeming it from utter baseness. One is his manly love for Brutus. Another is the fact that his ignoble envy of the man 'who did bestride the narrow world like' a colossus,' which moved him to his murderous design, was shot through with a Roman scorn of submission to an equal. But he was shrewd, cunning, treacherous. Shakespeare has put into the mouth of Cæsar a sketch of him that has the vividness of a photograph.

. . . If my name were liable to fear,
I do not know the man I should avoid
So soon as that spare Cassius. He reads much;
He is a great observer, and he looks
Quite through the deeds of men; he loves no plays,
As thou dost, Antony; he hears no music;
Seldom he smiles; and smiles in such a sort,
As if he mocked himself, and scorned his spirit
That could be moved to smile at anything.
Such men as he be never at heart's ease
Whiles they behold a greater than themselves;
And therefore are they very dangerous.

All the conspirators felt that their enterprise would gain immensely in popular favour if Brutus could be drawn into it.

O! he sits high in all the peoples hearts;
And that which would appear offence in us
His countenance, like richest alchemy,
Will change to virtue and to worthiness.

Casca was right. The basest deeds assume an air of speciousness when men of honour abet them.

In his task of maturing Brutus for conspiracy Cassius found the soil prepared. Brutus was already uneasy about Cæsar's intentions. That he was free from the selfish jealousy of the others his whole course of action and the spontaneous testimony of Antony prove. But he was passionately attached to republican principles—an idealist whose dream was to see a revival of the glorious past when Romans governed themselves and were fitted to do so. Monarchy spelt slavery to him. The trend of affairs, therefore, was causing him painful anxiety; and no less so that the man he mistrusted was his own intimate friend.

The scene in which Cassius sounds Brutus is a study in the art of insinuation. As the shouts from the Lupercal float down to them Brutus asks:

What means this shouting? I do fear the people
Choose Cæsar for their king.

There Brutus reveals his fear, and Cassius now sets himself so to magnify it, and guide his friend's reflections upon the cause of it, that Brutus shall see no way of salvation for Rome save in Cæsar's death. And very cunningly he does it. First he plays on the word 'honour.' Brutus has declared that he 'loves the name of honour more than he fears death.' 'Well,' says Cassius, 'honour is the subject of my story.' What so dishonourable as to live to be in awe of such a thing as oneself—a man, no braver, no better, than his fellows? Then, with delicate flattery, he reminds Brutus of the name he bears. Was he not the descendant and namesake of that hero 'that would have brooked the eternal devil to keep his state in Rome as easily as a king'? The word 'king,' thus introduced, supplies another note to strike. As Casca passes on his way from the games Cassius prompts Brutus to inquire of him what has happened on the Lupercal, and Casca tells in his blunt way how Cæsar was thrice offered a crown and thrice refused it with evident reluctance. But the final and most effective argument centres in the word 'Rome.' Cassius plays on the noble patriotism of his friend.

Rome is in real peril of a new tyranny, and the people are looking to Brutus for deliverance. To deepen this impression Cassius has anonymous letters sent to Brutus, purporting to come from different citizens who are alarmed at the situation and see in him their saviour.

Brutus yielded. Deliberately, under the pressure of his own convictions, he decided to join the plot against Cæsar. Not without keen mental conflict and much agony of soul did he reach that goal of purpose. Witness the impassioned scene between Brutus and Portia, a scene worthy of study because of the fine ideal of marriage that it pictures. The poet has compressed this period of irresolution and tumult into a few pregnant lines :

Since Cassius first did whet me against Cæsar
I have not slept.
Between the acting of a dreadful thing
And the first motion all the interim is
Like a phantasma, or a hideous dream ;
The genius and the mortal instruments
Are then in council ; and the state of man,
Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
The nature of an insurrection.

In the decision to seek Cæsar's death, and in its subsequent execution, Brutus reveals at once his nobleness and his weakness. His nobleness lay in his lofty ideal of duty and the earnestness with which he tried to realize it. Black as the crime was we are made to feel that Brutus was led to it by the purest motives. Not merely was he free from the selfish malice of the other conspirators—that would give him only a negative virtue; he had achieved a self-conquest that was as sublime as it was pathetic. The way he trod was not that of self-gratification, it was that of self-torture. Cæsar was Brutus's friend. The strength of the tie between them is repeatedly suggested, as in Cæsar's astonished cry, 'Et tu, Brute?' and in Antony's words :

This was the most unkindest cut of all;
For when the noble Cæsar saw *him* stab,
Ingratitude, more strong than traitors' arms,
Quite vanquished him.

Treachery to a friend is always esteemed a dark crime. But in this case, the blacker the act can be made to appear by stressing the friendship between Brutus and Cæsar the nobler in one respect does it become. For it was not the case that Brutus dragged in the dust his love of his friend, or was treacherous to him in his heart; it was that he rose above all personal sentiment on the towering height of patriotic duty. When he stabbed Cæsar he stabbed himself. And so we feel, as we listen to his defence before the civic mob, that there is more than oratory in it—there is truth. 'Not that I loved Cæsar less, but that I loved Rome more,' is the keynote of his action. The unsullied sincerity of both his love and his patriotism is touchingly expressed in his closing sentence—'With this I depart; that as I slew my best lover for the good of Rome, I have the same dagger for myself when it shall please my country to need my death.'

There is no more difficult problem than that which arises out of the mistaken action of a good man. History is full of abominable crimes committed by good men from lofty motives. It is an established moral law that acts must be judged by motives, but it requires modification. Conduct may be objectively bad when it is subjectively blameless. The inner light is imperative for the individual, but it may prove to be a will-o'-the-wisp leading to marshes of wrong. If a man is inspired by noble motives to base deeds it is evident that there is some twist or defect in him somewhere. Brutus was an assassin, and betrayed his best friend; he felt that he was acting for the best; and yet assassination and treachery are base crimes. There must, then, have been some weakness in him to account for such a terrible moral aberration.

The explanation seems to lie in the fact that Brutus was ill-balanced. He was deficient in the intellectual qualities of perception and judgement. There was thus nothing to hold in check his idealistic tendencies. Had he been, as idealists often are, a mere visionary, he might have spent

his life in idle harmless dreaming. But he was of an active temperament, and his keen sense of duty coerced him into the attempt to give actuality to his ideal.

The play abounds with examples of his lack of insight. It is evident in his failure to recognize the needs of his age. Political insight may easily degenerate into opportunism. But, on the other hand, political idealism may be blind to the real facts of the situation. It was so with Brutus. He did not see and appreciate the strength of the current that had set in against senatorial government. He did not see that republicanism, however beautiful in ideal, had lost its power to command the popular mind and to cope with the evils that had arisen. The times called for one supreme man to check the corruptions of the State and save its life. Cæsar was the man of the hour. So blinded was Brutus by his idealism that the blow he struck *for* his country proved to be a blow *at* his country.

His lack of insight shows itself again in his failure to weigh up correctly his coadjutors. When we see, in real life or on the stage, a good man being constantly 'taken in' by designing rascals, mingled with our indignation against them is a sense of irritation at him. We feel that a saint ought not to be a fool. Brutus irritates us in that way. No suspicion seems to have crossed his innocent mind that the motives of Cassius and the others were not as pure as his own. The innocence of Father Brown gave him a clearer insight into human nature and a deeper understanding of the motives that lead to crime. The childlike trustfulness of Dumas' bishop and his treatment of the escaped criminal that robbed him make us feel that he was sublimely magnanimous, but not that he was a silly dupe. Brutus does give us that feeling. By nobility of character he was the leader of the conspirators; through weakness of judgement he became their tool.

His want of foresight and judgement is further revealed by the fact that he had made no plans whatever for the

direction of affairs after the death of Cæsar. It may be said that the same was true of Cassius, who certainly was not lacking in mental keenness and balance; but it has not an equal force in his case. His ends were selfish. No doubt he foresaw to some extent what would happen, and was willing to take his chance in the general mêlée. We must remember, too, that more than once his game was checkmated by Brutus. But Brutus was striking for his country, and yet he failed to see that the only possible result of Cæsar's murder would be anarchy and civil war, against which he had made no provision.

Throughout his unhappy career Brutus is constantly blundering through his lack of perception; and the pathos of it is that his blindness is so often due to his natural nobility and generosity. The man of honour is truly handicapped in a career of crime. How admirable is the fine speech in which Brutus vetoes the proposal to kill Antony along with Cæsar!

Our course will seem too bloody, Caius Cassius,
To cut the head off, and then hack the limbs;
Like wrath in death, and envy afterwards;
For Antony is but a limb of Cæsar.
Let us be sacrificers, but no butchers, Caius.

It was magnificently generous, but it doomed the enterprise.

Again, what a fine blend of delicacy and magnanimity shows in the permission given to Antony to speak at Cæsar's funeral. The last honour shall be paid to the dead, and paid by his truest friend. Beautiful! But it was the concession of a man whose generosity blinded him to the realities of the situation.

Brutus had the dogmatic temper that frequently goes with idealism. He was so sure of the rightness of his own views that he could not brook discussion, and trampled ruthlessly on suggestions that conflicted with his sense of the fitness of things. Cassius saw the danger of leaving Mark Antony free; Brutus refused to consider his murder. Secure in the knowledge of the purity of his own motives in seeking

the death of Cæsar he could not imagine the crowd being swayed against him after he had stated his own case. Cassius foresaw how easily an orator like Mark Antony could turn the tide of public opinion even against Brutus. For that reason he opposed that magnanimous policy, but Brutus rode roughshod over his objections. It is pathetic to see a man, however noble his nature, so blindly self-confident; so determined to be generous when generosity can only lead to the wreck of all his hopes. Thus a noble life is stained with crime and marked by constant failure because in its lofty idealism was not sufficiently balanced by insight and common sense.

There is a side of the character of Brutus that we have not yet touched. If by temperament he was an Idealist, by creed and discipline he was a Stoic. He bears his multiplied reverses with heroic fortitude. When to all his other sorrows is added the bitterest of all, the death of Portia, his wife, he draws strength from his philosophy:

With meditating that she must die once
I have the patience to endure it now.

Yet his stoicism had not killed the gentler traits of his disposition. Most exquisite are the glimpses we get of his tender love for Portia, and his thoughtful consideration for Lucius, his page. Almost his last remark, before receiving the fatal sword-thrust, was an expression of joy that none of his countrymen had ever been untrue to him. In some respects he was better than his creed. It is disappointing, therefore, to find that at the last his Roman pride over-rides his moral conviction. On the question of suicide he says:

I know not how,
But I do find it cowardly and vile,
For fear of what might fall, so to prevent
The time of life.

But the picture of being led a captive through the streets of Rome conquers him, and he determines rather to take his own life than to suffer such indignity. So, when defeat is

certain he runs on his sword, and dies like a true Roman unvanquished to the end.

As we gaze upon the cold calm face of this man who, in the pursuit of a lofty ideal and under the inspiration of the purest passion, treacherously stabbed his best friend; as we see the pathos of his fate, to be the victim of his own magnanimity; we find ourselves assenting to the unparalleled panegyric of the rival who defeated him:

This was the noblest Roman of them all.
All the conspirators, save only he,
Did that they did in envy of great Cæsar.
He only, in a general honest thought,
And common good to all, made one of them.
His life was gentle; and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a Man.'

ERNEST B. STORR.

BRITISH TRAVELLERS ON AMERICAN MANNERS

I

IN the early days of the nineteenth century, when the American experiment in national democracy was still in its infancy, British travellers in the United States were inclined to adopt a supercilious and contemptuous attitude towards American institutions and manners.

The author of the *Sketch Book* pointed out that, while men of philosophical spirit and cultivated minds were sent out from England to ransack the poles, to penetrate the deserts, and to study the manners and customs of barbarous nations, it had been left to the broken-down tradesmen, the scheming adventurers, the wandering mechanics, the Manchester and Birmingham agents, to be England's oracles respecting America. He believed that something should be done to remedy the situation. These misrepresentations should cease. Britons and Americans should learn to appreciate each other, and, at least, strive not to give each other unnecessary pain by the diffusion of errors which engender antipathy.

Want of refinement, according to Mrs. Trollope, who visited the country in 1827, was the great American tragedy.¹ The Americans were curious and inquisitive; they bragged too much, and lacked decorum. Like Captain Hall,² whose work on America she read with a sense of hearty agreement, Mrs. Trollope felt convinced that the American sense of freedom and equality was at the root of American ill-breeding. She felt constrained to advise her own countrymen over and over again to hold fast to the British ways of living, and 'to hold fast by a constitution that insures all the blessings which flow from established habits and solid principles.' Democracy, she warned them, would only break up their

¹ Mrs. Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, 2 vols. (1832).

² Capt. Basil Hall, R.N., *Travels in North America*, 3 vols. (1828).

repose by introducing 'the jarring tumult and universal degradation which invariably follows the wild scheme of placing all the power of the State in the hands of the populace.'

Almost a decade after Mrs. Trollope, another English woman writer of equal accomplishment, but with more enlarged views, and consequently a better regulated temper, visited the United States and drew up her report of American manners and institutions.¹ Miss Martineau landed in America to begin a tour of the Republic. Unfortunately, on the very day she arrived in Boston, her sensibilities were shocked by the 'dragging of Mr. Garrison through the streets of that fair city'; and she felt it her duty to indulge in plain speaking with reference to the 'open affronts upon liberty, law and order.' Her faith, however, in democracy was not easily shaken. She continued on her tour, notebook in hand, looking into prisons, investigating clubs, factories, the plantations of the South, and the farms of the West. She was present at orations, land-sales, slave auctions. She was in frequent attendance on the Supreme Court and the Senate. She lived in palace-like mansions, in log-cabins, in farm-houses. She travelled in wagons, stages, and some of the best and the worst steam-boats. Also she visited several Indian tribes. Altogether, her experience was much wider than Mrs. Trollope's and everybody seemed to like her better. Being an economist, Miss Martineau was interested to find no paupers in the country. She was pleased with the happy conditions in the Lowell cotton mills. While she found everywhere 'spoiled, pert, and selfish children' in American homes, she was glad to observe that the excellence of temper in America was 'attributable to the different management of childhood in the one article of freedom.'¹ What displeased her most, of course, was the American traffic in negro slaves. She had as much to say on the evils of the system as most abolitionists. But, in summing up her impressions and experiences among the Americans, she generously declared

¹ Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, (1837) III, p. 163.

that, 'as far as goodwill, consideration and intelligence to help others are concerned, the Americans have the best manners I have ever seen.'

To Captain Frederick Marryat, however, 'the old lady with the trumpet' was just another credulous person who had been 'taken in' by the Americans. The Captain, who visited America soon after Miss Martineau, investigated the Union 'with the sole purpose of giving English readers a more truthful account than any that had appeared before'; and he found that Miss Martineau had credulously accepted 'jokes for the truth,' thus filling her book with absurdities and fallacies. For, mark you, said the knowing Captain:

'there is no country perhaps in which the habit of deceiving for amusement, or what is termed hoaxing, is so common. Indeed, this and the hyperbole constitute the major part of American humour. . . . If they have the slightest suspicion that a foreigner is about to write a book, nothing appears to give the Americans so much pleasure as to try to mislead him.'¹

In his *Diary*, Marryat observed that at first the Americans insulted and annoyed him. They were inhospitable, they appeared not to like English travellers. This behaviour he attributed to the unhandsome conduct of former travellers. Nevertheless, he too, following in the tradition of another naval officer, went out of his way to find things to censure and criticize in the infant Republic.

With the growing prosperity of the nation, the Americans developed what a French critic termed a 'boisterous faith' in material advancement. Their optimism, often reckless and extravagant, sometimes became sadly mixed up with most arguments for progress. By many, wealth came to be considered the only rational pursuit, and indeed, the only proper test of worth and importance. Society flourished in certain directions. All was apparently good humour and complacency. The gales of prosperity continued to blow over the land. 'What do you think of America?' asked the American of every traveller. 'What do you think of

¹ Captain Frederick Marryat, R.N. *Diary in America* (3 vols. 1839) I. p. 6 ff.

our fair City?' 'What do you think of the greatness of Americans?'

All this impressed Charles Dickens when he made his memorable visit to the United States in 1842. For four months, 'Boz' and his lady were the nation's guests. The Americans welcomed the most popular author of the age with open arms, thoroughly confident that he would see the glory and the splendour that reigned in their glorious Republic. Dickens wrote to his friends in England:

'In every town that we stay, though it be only for a day, we hold a regular levee or drawing-room, where I shake hands on an average with five or six hundred people. . . . Think of two hours of this every day, and the people coming in by hundreds, all fresh and piping hot, and full of questions, when we are literally exhausted and cannot stand. . . .'

In Boston, Dickens observed that 'the tone of society is one of perfect politeness, courtesy and good breeding.' In Cincinnati, he said, 'the society with which I mingled was intelligent, courteous and agreeable.' But, as he journeyed and grew more weary of the levees, the banquets and the self-laudation of most Americans, he detected 'blemishes in the popular mind of America' which, he said, were the prolific parents of innumerable broods of evil. When the great humorist returned home and published his *American Notes*, the picture he presented of America was a sad disappointment to his hosts. There was an uproar against what he said about the 'greatest nation on the earth.' Dickens was openly accused of deliberate falsehood and the grossest discourtesy. He had insulted a great people. It was a vulgar thing to do, even if he could prove every one of his statements to be true. The Americans were in no mood to be insulted by anybody. They were proud of their democracy, and did much swaggering and loud talking to keep their courage up in the presence of their detractors. Dickens made Mark Tapley remark that the Americans were 'born crowing.'

II

As they grew stronger and more prosperous, they should have become less sensitive to criticism. But the curious inconsistency of the American position was that, while they were *par excellence* a free people, the liberty which constituted their natural boast they most emphatically denied to others. What right, asked a writer in *Blackwood's*, in 1832, has the American to expect that an Englishman should prefer American institutions to those of his own country? It was a difficult point to settle. But the American made it a matter of mortal offence for British travellers to visit the United States and complain of the bad roads, the promiscuous inns, intruding companions bundling three in a bed, and mosquitoes. They were not to complain of the existence of slavery, or the want of decorum in courts of justice. But, surely, said the traveller, in climates like yours, there will be mosquitoes and yellow fevers and swamps? Surely, in a new country, thinly populated and not quite out of the pioneer stage, roads will occasionally be bad and inns indifferent? Must the traveller see everything white and golden, without tint of darker colour or alloy of baser metal?

However impartial the British traveller tried to be—and there were several who worked hard in this respect—he found it almost impossible to avoid giving offence to the sensitive American. Of course, it was unreasonable to expect every foreigner visiting America to cast off the prejudices and opinions of former life and at once appreciate the full and unrivalled excellence of American character and institutions. On the other hand, British travellers themselves admitted that certain British travellers were unnecessarily supercilious. ‘Generally speaking,’ said Duncan, ‘a traveller will meet with respectful treatment in America, if his own manners are not rude.’ Similarly, James Stuart of Dunearn observed that travellers were wont to enlarge on the rudeness of American manners, when, as a matter of fact, the

average American was civil and hospitable to all who treated him as an equal. It was the experience of James Boardman, who visited the United States in 1832, that 'the praise of Englishmen is esteemed by the Americans, perhaps somewhat more highly, on account of its being so rarely bestowed.'¹ Americans, as a rule, resented being told by unsympathetic aristocratic wits that the Republic was in 'great danger of breaking up,' and they 'saw red' when, by a summary process of generalization, the British traveller extended to all Americans, without inquiry, the peculiarities which were observable in a few. 'We do not ask to be sprinkled with rose water,' said Lowell, 'but may fairly protest against being drenched with the rinsings of an unclean imagination.'

On occasions it was pointed out by serious writers on both sides of the Atlantic that, however much the two Anglo-Saxon peoples might be bound together by a common ancestry, common language and traditions of liberty, in America there was an inherited hostility towards the foe the Americans had twice fought. Therefore, if these books written by British travellers were to serve the purpose of bringing the two peoples into closer relationship and a better understanding of each other's national character, some endeavour should be made to prevent unnecessary friction over trifles. On this point Sir Charles Lyell, who travelled in the United States in 1841, said:

'Travellers must make up their minds in this, as in other countries, to fall in now and then with free and easy people. . . . Whatever of good breeding exists here in the middle class is certainly not of foreign importation. And John Bull, in particular, when out of humour with the manners of the Americans, is often unconsciously beholding his own image in the mirror, or comparing one class of society in the United States with another in his own country, which ought, from superior affluence and leisure, to exhibit a higher standard of refinement and intelligence.'²

¹ John M. Duncan, *Travels in 1818-1819* (2 vols. 1823) II, p. 320. James Stuart, *Three years in America*, (2 vols. 1833) I, p. 121.

² Sir Charles Lyell, *Travels in North America* (2 vols., 1845) I, p. 189.

III

By the middle of the century, the democracy had demonstrated to the rest of the world their extraordinary ability to 'go ahead,' and once again the American, filled with pride and patriotism, swaggered about, asking everybody, 'How do you like America?' In 1857, when a serious commercial crisis plunged the Republic into gloom, when trade conditions were bad and a large number of men were out of work and clamouring for food, British interest in the Americans was indicated in a cartoon by John Leech; John Bull was represented as advising his friend Jonathan to quit 'living too fast!' A deal of American bragging was silenced for a while.¹

The confusion and clamour of war were soon upon the land. The conflict between the North and the South divided the country into two hostile camps. No British travellers were welcome, especially when it was learned that England had decided to remain neutral, but was in fact selling arms to the South as well as the North. The Northern papers were uttering anti-British threats . . . and then came the Trent affair (1861) and the blocking of Charleston Harbour by the Federals, causing much indignation in England.

When peace was restored after the Civil War, travellers came to view the wreckage and the damage. They were, however, much impressed by the quick recovery of the Northern States, and the tremendous changes that swept over the Southern. A British traveller, George Rose, observed that the old republican simplicity, of which he had heard so much, was giving way to luxury and extravagance. The wealthy were adopting liveries for servants, armorial bearings and other aristocratic insignia. There was also a decided fondness for military titles and uniforms. Americans were loud in their praises of War heroes and national glory. 'The

¹ Charles MacKay, LL.D., *Life and Liberty in America* (1859) pp. 217ff.

Americans,' said Rose, 'have lost all their sensitiveness, and are quite indifferent to the opinion of foreigners.'¹

The reconstruction period, often referred to as the 'tragic era' in American history, was a busy, strenuous and exciting period for travellers. David Macrae, who entered the United States from Canada, said that the experience was like 'pushing out from a sheltered creek into a current.' The Americans were up early, their shops were driving a vigorous trade, the trains and cars were crowded, and the rule of doing smartly what you have to do was applied even to eating.

'People sit down to the dinner table not to talk, but to eat; and I have seen men shoot a dinner down and be off to work again in the time it would take an Englishman to sharpen the carving knife and decide where he had better begin to eat.'

The average American, observed Macrae, manifested tremendous capacity for enterprise and speculation.² 'An American,' said another British traveller, 'loves hazard, risk, chance. He will not adopt a business or profession and plod with it through life . . . he will speculate and gamble his way to fortune.' This circumstance was no doubt stimulated by the basic ideas of republicanism. In the late war, the rail-splitter had become President, and the tanner had emerged as one of the greatest generals of the campaign! In the rapid material progress that followed in the 'seventies and 'eighties, it was observed that the best brains of the country went to the scramble for wealth, and there was much talk about politics being debased by the venality of the rich. 'The new aristocracy of riches,' wrote a British traveller, 'has enthroned king Shoddy on a magnificent scale.'³

What of the attitude of Americans towards British travellers? According to an English visitor from Newcastle, there was a noticeable change of feeling. 'Visitors are kindly

¹ George Rose, *The Great Country* (1868).

² David Macrae, *The Americans at Home* (2 vols. 1870).

³ Samuel Philips Day, *Life and Society in America* (1880) pp. 19 ff.

received and hospitably entertained. Our cousins scarcely regard an Englishman as a stranger at all. England is called the Old Country.' This was the experience of Thomas Huxley, John Tyndall and E. A. Freeman, who came on missions of goodwill. Britishers who were writing books on America and the Americans at this point in their history were mostly scholars, men of science, and authors who were invited to lecture on the lyceum circuit. The author of *The American Commonwealth* (1888) was perhaps the best informed Englishman on American matters among contemporary visitors to the States. His comments on American manners, institutions and problems were received on both sides of the Atlantic with unusual appreciation and interest. Bryce observed that under the American constitution, the population, originally so wanting in homogeneity, was now 'the happiest of all nations of the globe.' Again and again he insisted that 'democracy has not only taught the American people how to use liberty without abusing it, and how to secure equality; it has also taught them fraternity.' Among the drawbacks to American life, however, Bryce named the uniformity of social and political life. 'Travel where you will in the United States, you feel that what you have found in one place you will find in another.' This sameness and uniformity in State governments, party machinery, schools, charitable institutions, libraries, lecture courses, amusements, &c., he observed, tends to deprive social life in America of an intensity and richness of which it is capable, if each section was permitted to develop its own characteristics and individual charms.

As one might expect, these views were not shared by Matthew Arnold, who, having disdained the inhabitants of the United States for forty-odd years, resolved in 1887, in his sixty-first year, to have a closer view of America and the Americans. Incidentally, like Dickens and other British authors who sniffed at the Yankee 'greed for the dollar,' Arnold found no difficulty in convincing himself that it

was all right for an Englishman to reap the harvest of the American lecture circuit, while on a tour of investigation. Arnold had read Mrs. Trollope, Harriet Martineau and Dickens on the Americans. He arrived in America with certain preconceived notions concerning American culture and development. In New York, he attended a 'magnificent' reception given in his honour by Mr. Carnegie; in Boston, he was introduced to a cultured audience by Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes; and he met the poet Whittier, Charles Eliot Norton, and Professor Child. In Washington, he met the President and the 'really best men in Congress.' Not even the meeting with these men helped him to revise his notions. Arnold delivered his lectures, noticed a lack of those rare distinctions of Beauty, Elevation and a sense of the Interesting among the people he met, and returned to England more convinced than ever that the American, taking all things into consideration, was just another type of modern Philistine. There was not the same great outcry against Arnold's book on America¹ as the one that rose in protest when *American Notes* first appeared. Americans were growing up, perhaps. 'What the people really objected to in Arnold,' says Perry Robinson, 'was not any blundering thing he said of them, but the fact that he wore on inappropriate occasions in New York a brown check suit!'

With an acute and analytic intelligence, the socialist-novelist, H. G. Wells, sought to 'tear from the United States the secret that must underlie the *eclat* of so much material progress.' By his own account, Wells went about the country confronting all comers with the question, What are you going to make of the future of America? He was much depressed by the results:

'When one talks to an American of his national purpose, he seems a little at a loss. . . . The typical American has no sense of the State. The people leave national and social affairs too much in the hands of professional men.'

¹ Matthew Arnold, *Civilization in the United States* (1888).

In the American Eldorado, Wells detected what seemed like a rampant and quite incoherent individualism. Yet, although the dominance of individuals was wholly unquestioned, the isolated unit seemed to count for nothing. Why was it, he asked, that this 'richest, greatest country the world has ever seen' should have 1,700,000 children under fifteen years of age toiling in fields, factories, mines and workshops? Why was it that the energies and even the education of an idealistic people be so universally dedicated to the profit-making end of trade? So busy is the average citizen gathering his dollars that 'nobody is left over to watch the politician,' and, consequently, 'the boss, with his slavish army of heelers, waxes great amidst the general laxity.' America, says Wells, is 'simply repeating the history of the Lancashire industrialism on a gigantic scale, and under an enormous variety of forms.'

When the Great War burst upon an astonished world, for a time there was confusion of sentiment between Britons and Americans. Publicists of both nations worked overtime in an endeavour to strengthen the alliance between the 'English-speaking nations of the world.' Said the London *Spectator*:

'The two nations are bound to work together perfectly in the future because their interests, which are the interests of all civilization, demand this. To understand each other then we have only to avoid misunderstanding each other. . . . We speak the same language, we have the same political institutions, &c.'

Ultimately the British and Americans fought side by side 'to make the world safe for Democracy.' With peace came a world of new problems for the solution of which the two peoples had pledged to work together. But cold reality once again spoilt many a dream, and the mockery of all those promises of a new and better life for the common multitudes of men—promises which were held out by the leaders as a reward for great sacrifices of human life—made both the English and the Americans wonder about the integrity of political leadership in their respective countries.

In his book entitled *People of Destiny* (1920), Sir Philip Gibbs, war-correspondent and author, undertook to give a report on the mental attitude of the American people towards the problems of peace. He felt convinced that 'during this time of ruin in Europe, the Americans hold undoubtedly the fate of the world in their hands.' Their wealth, man-power, vital energy, gave them a prodigious influence in the shaping of the future. It is clear, from a reading of books of this type, that the British travellers in America had travelled a long way from the methods and attitudes of the Trollopes, the Dickenses and even the Matthew Arnolds of generations past. Sir Philip confessed that he was 'bound to say that during his visit to the United States, he found more to admire than to criticize.'

In the spirit of good fun, so it seems to us, G. K. Chesterton made an interesting tour of America, and in *What I Saw in America* (1921), published his impressions. He discovered that the American business man, quite apart from his love of money, was really a mystic. 'It is customary to condemn the American as a materialist because of his worship of success. But indeed this very worship, like any worship, proves him rather a mystic than a materialist. . . .' G. K. C. found that American uniformity was most evident in hotels. Broadly speaking, there was only one hotel in the country; the pattern of it was repeated in nearly all cities. But, he added, the American hotel is not America; it is American.

The fashion established by American publishers of bringing over English authors, whose works have made a hit with the American public, is as old as the *Pickwick Papers*. It is perhaps one of the reasons for the appearance of many of the more recent British travellers in America. Margot Asquith visited the country in 1922, to boost the sales of her *Autobiography*, deliver what might be termed 'lectures,' and incidentally write an aristocrat's impressions of the literary and other select groups she met. 'What can a woman know,' she asks herself, 'who arrived on the 30th of January

(1922) and left on the 4th of April, of America and her people?' We wonder. In those nine weeks, she assures us, she met and conversed with 'senators and niggers, farmers and reporters, judges and preachers, hotel proprietors and mayors, solicitors and soldiers, shopmen, doctors, men of science and commerce, and a few of the rarer class of both the fashionable and the learned.' As a result of these varied contacts, she felt she was in a position to say that the Americans were 'the most friendly people in the world,' but, she added, 'they are suffering from the uneasiness of the *nouveaux riches*.'

The perusal of these British travel books on America, covering the impressions and sentiments of a century of activity and development, is perhaps one of the most illuminating and entertaining ways of investigating the currents and cross-currents of international feelings and ideas based on personal likes and dislikes. The student of history and literature who has his copy of Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* will notice how little a great community changes its characteristics when once the main conditions of life have been fixed. 'These travellers may make a few remarks of their own,' says W. H. Massingham, 'they may note where a landmark has arisen, or an old one has disappeared, but, in the main, the fundamental characteristics of the country remain the same.' In one of the latest travel books by an English author, *The Provincial Lady in America* (1934), E. M. Delafield gives us a most delightful account of America and the Americans. The tone of the narrative, deceptively naïve, has the effect of a Jane Austenish kind of comedy. If Mrs. Trollope and Dickens could have achieved the Delafield tone in their comments on American manners, they would probably never have aroused the Americans of their day to violent wrath. The Provincial Lady arrives in America to boost the sale of her books. Trips to book stores and 'teas' that excite her wonder (because the one thing that cannot be had there is tea), are arranged by her publishers,

and 'little gatherings' of 400 women congregate to have their copies of her novels autographed by her. Then there are 'informal' dinners at which the Provincial Lady is overwhelmed by the almost indecent splendour of the wealthy hunters of literary lions and lionesses! Under the surface mildness of the descriptions of scenes and sights and people there is a caustic critical intelligence which, if displayed in a different way, would make Americans 'see red.' But those who can read between the lines are provided with a new British estimate of a certain class of Americans—the sort with whom Matthew Arnold and Margot Asquith, for instance, came into contact and mistook for representative Americans.

In summing up the question of manners of the American people in general, we cannot do better at this point than remind British travellers of the statement made by a recent English observer:

'In spite of all that has been written on the subject, there is perhaps very little difference between the manners of the American and the Englishman. Simply as a matter of observation, the differences between the English and the Italian manners hit you in the eye, while the differences between American and English manners are really microscopic; and manners, I take it, are the outward and visible signs of temperament.'

Be this as it may, what British travellers have to say about Americans never fails to find an interested hearing in these United States.

MONTAGU FRANK MODDER.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY IN IRELAND

PROSPER of Aquitaine in his *Chronicle* says that in 431 Pope Celestine ordained a deacon named Palladius and sent him as the first bishop to 'the Scots who believed in Christ' (*Scotti in Christum credentes*), that is, to the Scots in Ireland; and the Venerable Bede in his *Ecclesiastical History* makes a similar statement, using the same phrase.

The fact that Palladius was sent as a bishop would suggest that there were already in Ireland some scattered and isolated communities of Christians, even if Prosper had not told us so; for it was not the Roman custom to send a bishop as a pioneer missionary to an entirely heathen country. According to Zimmer there were missionaries at work in the southern part of Ireland in the third century; and Patrick Power maintains that refugee Christians fled to Ireland from the persecutions of Diocletian in Gaul more than a century before the coming of Palladius. Zimmer contends that Pelagius was an Irishman, but Healy shews that he was a British monk of Irish descent. Kuno Meyer asserts that, whether Pelagius was an Irishman or not, 'his faithful henchman, Caelestius, he of the plausible tongue, certainly was.' Both those theologians flourished in the beginning of the fifth century. Jerome calls Caelestius 'a corpulent Alpine dog, overloaded with the porridge of the Scots.'

There is some evidence that St. Ninian, the first Apostle to the Picts of Scotland, Bishop and Abbot of Candida Casa at Whithorn in Galloway, paid a visit to the north of Ireland and there founded a monastery in a place called Cluain Conaire. Ninian was known in Ireland as Moninn, and is commemorated in the *Martyrology of Donegal*. The Irish traditions make him retire from Britain and live the later years of his life in Ireland, but it is more probable that he died at Whithorn about 432. He brought the monastic ideal

to Scotland from St. Martin of Tours, whom he visited on his return to Scotland from Rome; and many Irish saints were trained in his monastery of Candida Casa.

Palladius is said to have landed at Inbher Dé (Wicklow Harbour). His mission was brief, for he died within a year, but not altogether ineffective, for he founded three churches in Co. Wicklow; and then, it is said, on account of the hostility of the people he proceeded to 'the land of the Picts': whether the Irish Picts or the Picts in Scotland is not quite clear; but a tradition that he was martyred at Fordun is recorded in the *Vita Secunda*, and there a 'St. Pledi' was long venerated, but it may have been another Palladius. News of his death was brought to Auxerre by two of his fellow-missionaries, Augustus and Benedict; and it was after that that St. Patrick went to Ireland. The popular belief is that Patrick also was commissioned by Pope Celestine, but it has no historical basis. The account of Muirchu Maccu Machtheni in the *Book of Armagh*, written in the ninth century, is clearly against Patrick having visited Rome and coming into touch with Pope Celestine; and Patrick's own authentic writings, *The Confession* and the *Epistle against Coroticus*, are effective witnesses against this supposition.

Patrick wrote to defend his position in Ireland against challenge, and to vindicate himself on the charge of arrogant presumption; and he never claims Papal commission or makes any mention of the Pope at all. He ascribes his call directly to God. The opening words of the Epistle are: 'Patrick the sinner, unlearned verily. I confess that I am a bishop, appointed (constitutus) by God, in Ireland. Most surely I deem that from God I have received what I am. And so I dwell in the midst of barbarians, a stranger and an exile for the love of God. He is witness if this is so . . . I have vowed to my God to teach the heathen, though I be despised by some.' And he continues: 'I make no false claim. I have part with those whom He called and pre-

destinated to preach the Gospel amidst no small persecutions, even unto the ends of the earth.' Patrick is in the Evangelical succession with Paul and Barnabas, with Silas and Timothy, with John Bunyan and John Wesley, with Thomas Coke, William Carey and David Hill.

Mr. H. C. Lawlor, in a paper on 'Early Irish Monasticism' read at the Church of Ireland Conference on October 12, 1932, says: 'Saint Patrick was an evangelist pure and simple. It is a common error to call him a missionary or his coming here a mission; a mission is "a sending," whereas he himself says that after rejection by his seniors he came of his own accord. This is a clear indication that his coming here was purely an evangelical expedition undertaken on his own initiative.'

But that is surely going too far. Patrick in his *Confession* speaks of being 'tempted by not a few of my elders, who came and (urged) my sins against my laborious episcopate,' and of being 'trampled upon,' and of having had raised 'as an occasion against me a matter which I had confessed before I was a deacon'; but it is clear that, in spite of opposition both before and after he was 'raised to the rank of bishop,' and although it 'displeased . . . not a few of my elders,' he went to Ireland as a missionary, to take up the task to which Palladius had first been designated, perhaps to Patrick's temporary disappointment.

From his own writings we learn that Patrick was born at Bannavem Taberniae (or Bannaventa Berniae) 'in Britannis'—probably, though not certainly, somewhere in South Wales or on the lower reaches of the Severn (possibly Caerwent). There is some dispute among scholars as to the year of his birth, but the late Professor J. B. Bury has given cogent reasons for determining it as 389.¹ His full name was Patricius Magonus Sucatus. His father, Calpornus or Calpurnius, was a landowner, a town-councillor (decurion) and a deacon in

¹ Prof. Eoin MacNeill (St. Patrick's latest biographer) emphatically declares for 385 or 386.

the Church, who had a small country residence (*villula*); while his grandfather, Potitus, was a presbyter. At the age of sixteen he was kidnapped and carried off to Ireland by marauders from that country, probably subjects of the Irish King Niall Noigiallach (Niall of the Nine Hostages), who is known to have raided parts of Britain in 405. Patrick does not mention the place of his captivity; he merely says: 'I went into captivity in Ireland'; but Muirchu tells us that his heathen master, Milchu or Miliucc Macu Buain, lived at Sliabh Mis in the country of the Cruidneni (Picts). This mountain is in Co. Antrim, and is to-day called Slemish (Slieve Mis). Between Slemish and the Hill of Skerry there is a townland called Ballyligpatrick: 'the Townland of Patrick's Hollow.' Dr. Whitley Stokes contends that it was there Patrick tended his master's sheep, and it was there he rose for prayer 'in snow, in frost, in rain; and I felt no hurt; nor was there any sluggishness in me . . . because then the spirit was fervent within me.' The rath of Milchu was probably on the hill of Skerry, which dominates the whole valley. Professor Bury rejected Slemish as the place of the captivity, as there he could find no 'Wood of Fochlad,' or 'Foclut'; and he regarded Croaghpatrick as the mountain of the captivity; but Dr. McNeill has proved that *Silva Focluti* is in Antrim and not far from Slemish.

After six years of captivity Patrick escaped in a vessel transporting Irish wolf-hounds to Gaul, and after many wanderings he reached his home again. About twenty years later the call came to him which made him return, with twelve followers, to Ireland. According to later traditions, between 411 and 432 he paid a visit to St. Martin of Tours, who is said to have been his mother's brother, and spent some years at Léris, the island monastery of the Mediterranean; and, after an interval at home, he laboured with Germanus, by whom he was consecrated bishop, at Auxerre; but there is nothing of this in his own writings. We are told that he was consecrated 'Apud Sanctum Amatorem,'

i.e. at the basilica of St. Amator, outside the city of Auxerre (not 'consecrated bishop by a certain Amatorex' as Miss Winifred M. Letts has it in her *St. Patrick, the Travelling Man*).¹ There is no evidence that the Pope was consulted, or that it even occurred to any one that he ought to be consulted.

If these traditions are correct, Patrick must have seen many woeful sights and met many fugitives from the ruined cities of Gaul. If he went straight to Lérins in 411 he may have seen actual warfare, for Constantine was then making his last stand at Arles. The years 411 to 415, which Bury assigns to Patrick's monastic life at Lérins, were years of sensational happenings. Patrick mentions the Franks in his Epistle. Did he see anything, one wonders, of the campaigns of Aetius against them? Did he see Nathi, the nephew and successor of the Irish King Niall, fighting at the head of his clansmen in the army of the Roman general? Salvian, who was possibly known to Patrick, draws a melancholy picture of the state of morals and culture in Gaul in those unhappy days. To one who, like Patrick, held in honour the name of Roman, those years could have brought little joy.

Patrick's teacher, Honoratus, the founder of the monastery of Lérins, became Bishop of Arles before Patrick went to Ireland. Pope Celestine strongly disapproved of a monk of Lérins being raised to the bishopric, and in 428 wrote a letter of remonstrance and reproof to the Bishops of the Provinces of Vienne and Narbonense, who had elected him. Honoratus had travelled a good deal, and in his letter the Pope condemns the elevation of 'wanderers and outsiders,' (peregrini et extranei) over deserving local clergy. 'Let no one,' he writes, 'by any means steal into another man's sphere, nor dare to arrogate to himself the reward due to another.' How little effect the letter had is shewn by the fact that when the See was again vacant in the following year the bishops followed

¹ Possibly Amator, who was the predecessor of Germanus, and died about 418, admitted Patrick to minor orders.

exactly the same course as before, and elected another monk of Lérins, Hilary, as Bishop of Arles. Hilary was almost certainly a fellow resident with Patrick at Lérins, and was doubtless one of the brethren and saints of the Lord whose faces, he tells us, he longed to behold again. Pope Leo the Great having uncanonically received a bishop whom Hilary and Germanus had deposed, Hilary went to Rome to protest; and he and the Pope quarrelled so sharply that Hilary judged it prudent to decamp secretly from the Imperial City. Leo was furious, and wrote cancelling the sentence of Hilary and Germanus; and he induced the feeble and immoral Emperor Valentinian III to issue an Edict in which the contumacy of Hilary was condemned, and it was laid down that any bishop who declined to go to Rome when summoned by the Pope should be compelled to do so by the civil power.

It was on his visit to his home in Britain that the call to return to Ireland first came to Patrick. In a dream 'a man whose name was Victoricus' came from Ireland with letters and gave him one of them, which was entitled: 'The Voice of the Irish'; and while he was reading it aloud he heard 'the voice of them who lived beside the wood of Foclut' crying: 'We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and walk among us once more.' His hesitation to obey the call at once probably arose from his lack of learning and his consciousness of the need of adequate training.

The introduction of classical learning, as well as Christianity, into Ireland is popularly ascribed to Patrick, but the opinion will not stand critical examination. In his own writings he makes no claim to be a scholar, but on the contrary he has a very humble opinion of himself, and says that he was ignorant of letters. A slave till the age of twenty-two, he could never hope to attain to the intellectual eminence of some of those with whom he was associated in the learned seclusion of Lérins. He was a preacher and an organizer rather than a man of letters—*homo unius libri*, but with that

one book, the Bible, he was remarkably familiar. Archdeacon Kerr says: 'In almost every paragraph of his writings St. Patrick's devotion to the Holy Scriptures is made plain. His intimate knowledge of the whole Bible is amazing. His mind is so saturated with it that his thoughts naturally, as if unconsciously, clothe themselves in Biblical phraseology. . . . The Bible is to him the fount of authority, the direct revelation of the will of God.' 'His Latin,' says Professor Bury, 'is as "rustic" as the Greek of St. Mark and St. Matthew'; but in that respect he was no worse than many of his famous contemporaries and successors, and, as Mr. Hugh Graham has pointed out, his Latin is no more 'rustic' than that of Gregory of Tours, who lived a century later.

The introduction of the Roman alphabet into Ireland has been attributed to Patrick on the strength of statements in the *Tripartite Life* that he wrote 'Abgitoria' for his noble converts. The words 'Aibgitir in Crabaid' in the *Tripartite Life* (translated 'Alphabet of Piety') plainly mean, however, a primer of Christian Doctrine, and a specimen is given of such a work. And in the Würzburg Codex the words 'Abgitir Crabaid' are glossed 'Initium fidei.'

Kuno Meyer contends that the seeds of classical learning were sown in Ireland before Patrick arrived, viz: in the first and second decades of the fifth century, by scholars from Gaul who fled to Ireland before the barbaric invasions of the Visigoths and Franks. He quotes from a sixth-century entry in a Leyden MS. which states that, owing to a barbarian invasion, 'all the learned men fled from Gaul, and in transmarine parts, i.e. in Ireland and wherever they betook themselves, brought about a great advancement of learning to the inhabitants of these regions.' This, in Meyer's view, is supported by a passage in Patrick's *Confession* where he says: 'Ye clever sirs, ye rhetoricians who know not the Lord, hear therefore and search it out. Who was it that called up me, fool though I be, out of the midst of those who seem to be wise and skilled in the law, and powerful

in word and in everything?' Meyer thinks the reference is to the pagan rhetoricians from Gaul who regarded disdainfully the 'illiterate' Apostle to the Irish.

But, while Patrick did not introduce classical learning into Ireland, his indirect influence must have helped considerably to spread it. The very fact that Latin was the official language of the Church gave it a new importance and dignity. And to equip a native ministry he found it necessary to establish Christian schools. After twenty years' peripatetic evangelism, he established (*circa* 450) a school at Armagh, of which his 'son in the gospel,' Benin or Benignus, was placed in charge, for the training of clergy. It was followed up by the establishment of similar seminaries at Dysart, Rath Muighe, Saul, Slane and Trim. These schools were the precursors of the Irish monastic schools which multiplied so rapidly in the sixth century, but they were not monastic foundations. Patrick's life was too full of missionary labours for him to have time for the foundation and government of monasteries. His time was fully occupied with the work of converting the islanders and founding churches. He seems to have consecrated one or more bishops to rule over every church he founded. As the secular system of Ireland was tribal, so also was the system of the Patrician Church, and the bishops appointed in each clan were, whenever possible, drawn from the same family. In some cases the secular head of the clan was also the religious head, and in such cases the devotion of the clan to its chief was strengthened by the double bond. There was no metropolitan jurisdiction in the Patrician Church, though great deference was naturally paid to Patrick himself; and there was no subjection to Rome, though Patrick, a British Celt, was, like St. Paul, proud of his Roman citizenship, and strove to bring Irish Christianity more into line with that of Western Europe.

Armagh was not the first church founded by Patrick. That honour belongs to Saul in Co. Down. When Patrick sailed up Loch Cuan (Strangford Lough) his boat entered

the estuary of the River Slan. There, on the 'Island Plain' (Magh Inis), was the dun of Dichu, son of Trichem, the *sabhall* or barn of which became Patrick's first church in Eire. Muirchu says: 'He remained there many days, and chose clergy, and did deeds of love, and there the Faith began to grow.' It was there also Patrick died, and there, according to Professor Bury and Canon N. J. D. White, that he was buried. Quite close to the landing-place is Raholp Church, founded by St. Tassach, who gave Patrick the Sacrament of Holy Communion before his death.

There are few things in human character so rare, so winning and attractive, as the combination of strength and selflessness, courage and humility, which we find in St. Patrick.¹

W. G. HANSON.

¹ Principal authorities consulted:

Bury, J. B., *Life of St. Patrick*.

Concannon, Helena, *St. Patrick: his Life and Mission*.

Graham, Hugh, *The Early Irish Monastic Schools*.

Healey, John, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*.

Hyde, Douglas, *Literary History of Ireland*.

Meyer, Kuno, *Learning in Ireland in the Fifth Century*.

Stokes, Whitley, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*.

White, Newport, J.D., *A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick*.

Zimmer, Heinrich, 'Ireland' in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, Vol. VIII.

Macneill, Eoin, *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*.

A MEDIEVAL CHURCHMAN AND WORLD UNITY

THE Roman world of law and order was broken into pieces by the barbarian invasions and a period of wild anarchy followed. Charlemagne in the eighth century made a manful attempt to restore order to Western Europe and to discipline the adjacent barbarism by imposing on it a Christian culture; and he succeeded in establishing a Christianized Roman Empire on a Teutonic basis, and by military and administrative genius and genuine piety he achieved much in this direction. However, the New Empire rested on his personal character and prestige and the story of the decline after his death is both pitiful and tragic.

His son Louis, called the Good-natured, was not without ability: his private character was beyond reproach, but he made grievous blunders. By his first wife he had three sons, the eldest, Lothaire, he associated with himself in the Empire and caused an oath of allegiance to be sworn to him, and the younger sons, Pepin and Louis, were given small territories in strict subordination.

On the death of his first wife Louis married Judith, a young, beautiful and very ambitious woman. By her he had a son, Charles, the beloved child of his old age, and for the rest of his reign he was engaged in scheming and intriguing in order that this youngest child should have some territory for himself, and these efforts involved the breaking of earlier agreements and thus the weakening of the authority of the elder brothers. This policy pursued continuously provoked the elder sons to rebellion, and at one time Louis was dethroned by his sons and the queen placed in a nunnery. The struggle between the brothers continued after the old Emperor's death. Lothaire's efforts to secure the unity of the Empire were fruitless, and, in the battle of Fontenoy, there was not only a terrible wastage of the strength of the Empire, but the result was that the frontiers were left exposed to invasions

from Vikings and Saracens. Lothaire called various Councils and sought to establish internal peace and to protect the frontiers, but it was in vain, and when, disillusioned and heartbroken, he passed into a monastery to die, in 855, the Empire of Charlemagne lost its last semblance of unity.

Now all this sounds like a petty domestic controversy and many writers have taken this view, moved to pity by the sight of sons in revolt against a good-natured father. But this is not the whole truth, for it is a highly significant fact that some of the greatest churchmen, like Ebbo, the zealous missionary bishop of Rheims, and Agobard, the reforming bishop of Lyons, took the side of Lothaire and drew the Pope of Rome to the same side. M. Dufourq, in his *L'Avenir du Christianisme*, and C. Dawson in his *Making of Europe*, have pointed out that Lothaire, whatever his personal character may have been, did stand for the preservation of the unity of Charlemagne's empire, and therefore for peace and culture and civilization, and that his father's policy made for disruption, disorder and the formation of several rival kingdoms, and thus at last to the triumph of diverse customs and personal and private law in Feudalism. In other words, Agobard and Ebbo were the internationalists of their day, who wished to unite all classes and races in one transcending, all-embracing, Christianized, world empire, and in these days, we who are seeking some World Order which shall be above the national and racial feuds of to-day, and which shall ensure peace and well-being for all, and the Christian values may look back with interest to hear the word of Agobard.

His writings have been collected in Migne P.L. 104. He was born in 779 in Spain, became associated with Liedrad, Bishop of Lyons, and succeeded him in 814 in that bishopric. He attended many Gallican councils, at Compiègne, Paris, Lyons, Langres and Attigny. He was deposed at Thionville for his share in the rebellion of Louis' sons and he retired to Italy, but he was restored to favour in 838 at Quercy and

died in 840. He consistently stood for the cause of Lothaire and wrote bitterly of the ambition of Judith, the Queen.

Agobard was a scholar of repute, and a master of dialectics. He was a student of the Fathers, especially Augustine, whom he frequently quotes and by whom he was greatly influenced. He accepted the findings of the Great Councils and the ancient creeds. His writings are full of Scriptural quotations, for the Bible to him was the final authority, but he held surprisingly modern views of the inspiration of the Bible. He did not believe in verbal inspiration and, arguing with Abbot Fredigisus, contended that inspiration did not extend to the outward voice or grammatical form. There were grammatical faults and problems of translation and interpretation to be considered. He believed that the Divine revelation came through human channels and thus one could not say that the Holy Spirit spoke in the halting voice of Moses or the style of Paul. Form and content must be distinguished.

Agobard's theological works include a treatise against the Adoption heresy, and another attacking the worship of images and pictures and Saints, and a sermon on the 'Truth of the Faith.'

Now Agobard's policy of unity was based on his theology. There is no pressing to their terrible logical conclusions the Augustinian doctrines, but Agobard feels the attraction of Augustine's great conception of the Sovereignty of God. He wrote of God as Creator, Sustainer of the world, wise, ineffable, mysterious and yet ever righteous and just. His ways are past finding out and His Purposes often hidden from men, but His sovereign Will works in infinite wisdom. Thus Agobard rejected the theory that evil spirits bring certain disorders on the world apart from the Divine permission. There were men who believed that by human devices they could control the hail or the thunder, and that by sprinkling certain dust could bring a curse on land or cattle. Such superstitions were to him not only foolish but

positively blasphemous and he rejected them by appeals to Scripture, the harmony of Nature and reason. Further, he refused the worship of saints or angels. Worship must be directed to God alone. Images and pictures were allowed for ornament or for teaching, but to worship such was idolatry. Honour martyrs if you like, but they must not be worshipped. God is a Spirit and His only Image is Jesus and worship is not of material things but in spirit. So Agobard anticipated the Protestant attitude of later days in his opposition to image worship.

To Agobard, God was a Trinity in Unity, mysterious yet revealed in regard to character and purpose in the Incarnate Son of God, Jesus, who came to redeem men from sin through His blood and who, though Man by assumption of humanity, yet remained essentially Very God of Very God. Thus God was to him not only sovereign Will but condescending Love, not only Creator but Father.

The Grace of God was an objective fact. Agobard believed that it reached men through the Church, the Sacraments and the Priest, so that even if the priest were an evil liver, he, properly ordained, could be the instrument of grace. He might sin, lose his own soul and yet be the instrument of salvation to others. This view, incredible to many of us, suggests a view of Grace as physical rather than personal, as something given rather than God Himself giving. Yet it was an effort to safeguard the objective nature of Sacramental Grace.

It must be clearly understood, therefore, that Agobard's world order depended upon his conception of One God, graciously revealed in Jesus Christ. He saw the whole world in sin before God, bearing the original stain which involved the race in the Fall. All have sinned, none have done or can do good of themselves and all men of every race and every class are in one condemnation.

He rejected Pelagianism. No one is good but God alone and from Him alone can come the Good. His grace must

initiate as well as consummate salvation. Man is good, not in his own goodness, but in the goodness of God, 'who is the fount and origin of kindness.' Yet though fallen, men were made in the image of God and that image can be restored. Agobard believed that the Church, organized with its Sacraments and Priests and Councils, was God's instrument for building up the City of God which meant the new order of Peace, and this Church system was equally valid for all classes and all races.

Certain results follow from these postulates. One God should mean One Faith, One Baptism, One Doctrine. He believed that some common teaching was necessary for unity. Hence his strong opposition to the Jews and to heresy. Right teaching was even more important in a priest than right living, for it was the priest who taught wrong doctrine, though he lived well, who was to be anathematized. Agobard did not see that a rigid metaphysical creed, imposed by force, could never be a proper substitute for a gracious personal revelation freely accepted, but he did see that serious and vital divisions in matters of belief might prove a real hindrance to the world order and unity which he sought.

Agobard was equally anxious about the Law. The diverse customs of the separate kingdoms filled him with fear. There could be no peace, save in the supremacy of one legal system, impartially administered and everywhere accepted. In particular he opposed the barbarian custom of reliance for judgement on ordeals of hot iron or hot water or on success achieved in duels or battles. He pleaded for a law which allowed for the sifting of evidence on oath of worthy witnesses by carefully trained magistrates and judges. He evidently wanted to see a revival of the Roman legal system, carefully administered according to definite procedure and precedent. A world order demanded international law and could not be maintained by the use of force or the resort to battle. For force settles nothing and appeal to chance destroys reason.

However, Agobard goes beyond an appeal to common doctrine and law. It is, after all, the religious bond which holds God's world together. He placed a great value on the law of the Church as representing the mind and will of God. Hence in an emergency the Church could override the State and depose an Emperor. To Agobard, the Pope was the successor of Peter and had the power of the keys, but this power was limited, for if the Pope 'comes to fight rather than to make peace he must be repulsed.' The interests of the Pope must, therefore, be subordinate to the interests of the world order, but the Pope representing the universal Church might have precedence over a merely Gallican Council. This raising of the Church and the Pope to authority had its perils, for Agobard has himself shown how the Church could be corrupted by simony, greed and lust, and a Church which used secular means and was governed by secular priests could not be adequate for expressing God's mind in the world. Yet in those days, before democracy and parliaments had entered on the scene of action, it was well that there was some authority on earth which, claiming at any rate to speak in the name of God's righteousness, could place a limit on irresponsible tyranny or depose an unjust king.

In this Church, which was to bring in the City of God, there was to be no difference 'of race, condition or sex, angels or men, one home, one City of God, one Head of a wonderful Unity, even Christ.' 'Before God all are one body of Christ, where all praise God, slave and lord, poor and rich, unlearned and learned, weak and strong, workmen, noblemen and emperor and all invoke God as Father since all are brethren.' 'No one despises or exalts one another, there is no Jew or Gentile, Aquitanian, Lombard, Burgundian, Alemannian, slave or free, but Christ in all things, whether Paul, Apollos or Cephas. The Lord suffered once in His blood to make those afar off near and to end the enmity.' These tremendous passages give a key to Agobard's mind as they also represent

his view of Christianity and the City of God, international, interracial, binding all together in Christian loyalty and service.

It is interesting to note his references to slavery. To him the fact of sin and the Fall of Man is responsible for its existence. 'The sins of Man exacting, by the most just but hidden judgements of God, some are raised to Divine honours, others depressed in the yoke of service.' Here is the medieval theory once more expressed and its weakness is obvious. Originally man was free and equal, slavery and inequalities have come in through the Fall of Man, but why slaves alone should bear this burden is never clearly stated. Agobard has certain definite applications to make of this theory. He wrote against the Jews who, through their wealth, their control of trade, had established themselves in the favour of the Emperor and evidently had attached to their houses many Christian slaves. Agobard's criticism of the Jews and refusal of fellowship with them may not have been without excuse in those days, but it will arouse no sympathy in our hearts. Nevertheless the connexion of this criticism with the problem of slavery is interesting. No Jew ought to hold a Christian as a slave, lest he deprive him of the opportunities of Church life to which he is entitled and lest he force on him Sunday labour. He favoured compensating the Jews but all Christian slaves held by them ought to be set free.

His reasoning carries him beyond the question of slavery in Jewish hands. 'Every man is a creation of God and God who created in the womb, brought forth, granted life, must have a greater part in each man than the one who by giving twenty or thirty solidi enjoys the service of his body. Each slave owes to his carnal Lord the work of his bodily members, but to the creator alone the religion of the mind.' Agobard made much of the difference between outward and bodily service and the interior and spiritual liberty. Yet it is clear that the one will ultimately demand the other. He quoted

the case of Philemon and Onesimus to show that a man, though a slave, is made in the image of God, and is subject to no one, angel or man, but to God alone. Slavery is the result of sin, but it is of temporal and relative importance. But behind all these conventions and customs there is the outstanding Christian fact, all are brethren and sons of God, because He is Father of all. This is the real bond of the new world order which builds the City of God. Neither rigid dogma nor revised Roman law, nor even a share in the sacramental system of grace can quite suffice. We are all brothers and sons and we ought to love one another as we love God.

Agobard endeavoured to apply this truth to the question of Ordeals. There may be just wars, in defence of established order and for the purpose of Christianizing barbarians, but Agobard believed that when ambition or avarice or the desire for power entered the war was no longer a just one, for to him cupidity was the root of all evil. He rejected the appeal to force for the purpose of settling disputes as contrary to the revealed character of God and as completely futile for establishing justice. Agobard had a glimpse here of the great New Testament truth vindicated in the history of the Church—‘Victories are won by those who die rather than by those who kill,’ an illuminating sentence of tremendous implications. Agobard quoted the example of the martyrs, Paul’s great chapter on Love and Christ’s teaching about loving one’s enemies.

Peace and order is the great concern and for it Agobard pleads, ‘I raise my heart to Jesus, desiring that, without the effusion of blood, these unjust tumults may be quieted.’ ‘If the Pope comes quietly, peacefully, receive him, if he comes for fighting repel him.’ Agobard wants peace, but it can only come where there is one law to be administered, one faith to be accepted, above all, one life to be lived, brotherly and filial. The City of God is ultimately the family life of sons and brothers and the bond of its fellowship is

love. This Love connects heaven and earth, Church militant with the Church triumphant, temporal interests with an eternal significance, in one vast universal order.

This is the ideal, then and now. Agobard was not always consistent in the pursuit of it. He did not carry to the utmost lengths the implications of his own teaching. Moreover the grace of God of which he wrote was something less than a gracious relationship, only discovered in a personal response of love, and by limiting it strictly to a particularly organized and visible community, sacramental and priestly, he unduly limited the magnificent range of God's activity and power. Nevertheless he was very conscious of his limitations, and once he wrote with pathos that 'the concord of the City of God and the justice of the people, because it is so great a thing, perhaps is impossible to man.' He learnt sadly that in this world one had to be content with something less than one's ideals, yet he did see a great ideal, that at any rate is something to record. In some way he stood for this transcending love of God in Christ drawing all together by His grace into the ultimate unity of world fellowship, the only basis for an ordered peace. He believed there was a City of God, over against the City of Sin and he believed the City of God would prevail at last because it was in God's purpose and he believed in all this because he possessed a great theology of an Eternal God who once assumed manhood in Jesus, to save the world by making it one.

DOUGLAS W. LOWIS.

JUDAISM AND GENTILE CHRISTIANITY IN THE THIRD CENTURY

THE term '*nations of the world*' used in the Gospel of Luke conveys a broader meaning and hides a more significant history than most of the readers of chapter twelve are fully aware. The first Greek-speaking followers of Christ understood in the phrase '*ta ethna tou kosmou*' the very same ideas, which the Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent '*ummot haolam*' brought home to the immediate disciples of Jesus.

The common origin of both phrases cannot be questioned or doubted. The Jewish use of this term—which is the chief object and the main justification of this paper, although many sidelights will fall on passages in the Gospels and Epistles—is noteworthy from more than one point of view and needs elucidation from the theological aspect as well as from its historical background. The sacred texts of both religions may derive much help from such an investigation, for the better understanding of the clearness of their teaching. Thus, the still inadequately or wrongly interpreted relation between the Early Church and the fully developed Synagogue, or the struggle and friendship of Judaism and Christianity, their common aims and their dividing differences, may be presented in some new form as far as such an attempt can be made in a short essay and by means of this ONE out of the many problems involved in such a task. The term under examination extends to another likewise very important problem, namely, to the attitude of these two religions to the great world of paganism and philosophy, Greece and Rome, barbarism and civilization. In spite of some progress in historical and theological research heavy clouds of darkness still cover the horizon of these studies and a good deal of uncertainty bars our vision. A renewed discussion of these problems, especially by employing a new method and adducing old but hitherto ignored

material, may contribute some light in this confusion of theories and help future researches in this field of knowledge.

Jewish teachers manifest a strong tendency to convey their conception of God by coupling His names or combining His divine attributes with the Hebrew and Aramaic words for World (*OLAM-ALMA*). This is the more remarkable for this use of the Hebrew word is by no means Biblical. Lexicographers and commentators rightly draw the attention of the student to the well established fact that Olam in the Bible never implies the meaning of *World*—not even in the comparatively youngest strata of the Scriptures. The introduction of this thought into the Hebrew word cannot be located geographically or fixed chronologically. All traces are wiped out which could answer this query; yet, nevertheless, in my opinion it was a more important landmark in the religious development of the Jewish people than that alleged, but surely much exaggerated and unduly advertised innovation, the belief in the resurrection of the dead. The ages may be divided according to the conception of Olam, the times before and after the idea of the ‘World’ took firm root in the religious outlook and feeling of the Jews. This is of greater importance than the belief in resurrection for the very reason that the belief in future bliss and future life may have existed even in the earliest times.

Much weightier is the change in the inner meaning of the word Olam, which had previously only a temporal meaning, but now, however, was employed to make the Hebrews think universally, by substituting it for the earlier term ‘heaven and earth,’ or ‘visible place.’ Such changes surely do not come about by mere whims of antiquarians or reforming linguists. For, the influence of this innovation is exceedingly strongly felt in the language of religion, in hymns and prayers, in sermons and instructions, when the craving soul seeks nearness and oneness with God. Here, in teaching and praying, the Jew joins everything which seems to him lofty

and sacred enough, high and worthy of his God, in this term, World. God is to him, whether he be a learned scribe or an ordinary member of the community, the Father of the World, the Lord, Master, King and Judge of all the Worlds. Man thinks of Him as of the Rock, the Height—the Greatness of the whole World. He invests the worlds with the divine characteristics by calling Him the Righteousness, the Goodness, the Wealth, the Glory, the Secret, the First, the Unique of the World. Sometimes God is appealed to or described as the Creator, Maker, and Former of the Universe or Worlds. Surely, these names must have been drawn from a religious well, the waters of which were sweetened by the conception of Olam, or World, or Universe? To the Jew trained in Rabbinic theology this Universe could not have a simple idea. For, he knew besides this visible world another one too, an invisible one, the world to come. There were Jewish sects whose adepts denied or would not submit to such a doctrine. They felt that one world is quite sufficient for their liking. This doctrinaire difference may appear to some to-day as a dispute about an antiquated dogma. In fact, it affects the deepest questions of morality and ethics. A man who is guided by the belief in *One World* must be in his conduct and mentality different from the believer in a dualistic conception. The former does not fear future retribution, the latter directs all his steps in this world with the eye to a sure future reward or punishment in an invisible world. This urges him to do good deeds of charity and piety, and to avoid the snares and pitfalls of sin and evil. The other pays no heed to such considerations as being out of the range of his religion. Furthermore, this multiplication of designations for the Deity combined with the term Olam may have developed, if not originated, in the fact that some religious thought, perhaps of Jewish and Christian Gnostics, who left their mark on both religions, was inclined to divide this imperfect and the future perfect world, by ascribing the latter to God, whilst the former was guided by the prince.

of this world, the ruler of this aeon, the *demiourgos* and so on. The true monotheist could not acquiesce in such irreligious speculations. Consequently they emphatically and assiduously referred to God as Ruler, &c. of all the Worlds.

More remarkable is the fact that when the Gospels and the Rabbis speak of the nations outside the Church or the Synagogue, they refer to them as the 'nations of the World,' contrasting them to the nation of God, by which they meant either Christians or Jews, or, as both preferred to call themselves 'the true Israel.' This implies not only a living contrast between Gentiles and Israelites, but also between God and the World. 'For all these things do the nations of the world seek after'; namely, what they shall eat and what they shall drink, but the nation of God must not be of little faith and seek after these things, nor must they have a doubtful mind. Similarly, when Paul warns of and condemns the wisdom of the world, he construes the same contrast as Jesus. The full term in the Epistle ought to be 'the wisdom of the nations of the world.' He preferred to use the shorter term in order not to offend the Gentiles who may have been proud of their Greek philosophy and wisdom. In reality the fuller term occurs in the prohibition ordered by the Jewish sages, who disallowed the study of the wisdom of the nations of the world.

The use of the term in this literature leads to some remarkable observations. Up to a certain period the designation here spoken of is used in the same sense as that in which the earliest documents of the Church apply it, namely to heathens and pagans. Yet, after a certain age, one can notice that the application is turned to denote Christians from among the Gentiles. This must have happened at a time when the Church finally broke away from the Synagogue; and when the Synagogue became cognizant of the hopelessness of further waiting for reconciliation between mother and daughter. It was the period when the final struggle embittered both camps, and in the fierceness of the battle words fell on both

sides which caused irreparable harm to both sections, and left indelible impressions on the history of Christianity and Judaism alike. Many of the cruel tragedies of the Middle Ages, all the persecutions of the Jews, all the barbarities within and outside the Church, all the curses which breed dissatisfaction against religion and blacken religious activities up to this very day, could have been spared if the slogan had not arisen that Israel, the Jewish people, was cursed, deprived of the name Israel, forsaken by God and condemned to live as an outcast among men and nations. This put on the Jew wandering through the ages and continents the mark of Cain. In defence the Jews claimed to be the true Israel, and their opponents the Gentiles, the heirs to and bearers of the title, 'nations of the world.'

It is quite true to say that for a long time the rank and file of the Synagogue took a passive part in this momentous battle, which decided the fate and progress of human civilization for many centuries to come. The Synagogue, fighting for her own existence against heavy odds, facing in a centuries-long fight Imperial Rome, her generals and priests, her legions and lawyers, her culture and corruption, could do nothing more than witness from afar the most deadly contest between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. The leaders of the Church for their part, in the third century did not care much to convert the Jews to their way of thinking or worshipping. Their mind was set upon the destruction of the Jewish-Christian community, as being neither a part of the Church nor a member of the Synagogue. Every effort was made to induce by love and by force these Christians to give up their Jewish customs and usages, the observances and thoughts of the Old Testament, as incompatible with the new teachings and revelations. The teachers of the Jews could not remain altogether silent. Some, of course, in their zeal for their own religion condemned these outsiders; yet there were others who tried to offer spiritual aid for their sorely tried brethren, who had

gone astray through their belief in the new religion, and, in their admiration for the Jewish-Christians' loyalty to the law, encouraged them in their endurance, probably hoping for their return to the Synagogue.

One of these teachers assures these law-abiding Jewish-Christians, whom he calls Jewish transgressors, of their full share in future life and happiness. This toleration and generosity may appear surprising to historians of those remote ages. Yet students of Rabbinic literature will find that some, though not all, contemporary teachers accurately estimate and value the worth of Gentile-Christians, the 'nations of the world' in their new and altered garb. R. Abbahu, a teacher of this period in the Greek-speaking Caesarea where, some decades before, the Church Father Origen developed his marvellous and never to be forgotten Biblical scholarship, said that there are two fundamental doctrines acknowledged by the nations of the world: namely, that the Holy One blessed be He created the world in six days and furthermore that they believe in the resurrection of the dead. Even if it is granted that the latter belief penetrated into the religion of the heathens, the other teaching was not accepted by them. Caesarea was a Christian city at this time; no doubt it was there that R. Abbahu met Gentile-Christians, who accepted the Biblical teaching about the creation of the world and, naturally, believed in the doctrine of resurrection, the pivot of Christian tradition. Bearing in mind the change of the meaning, which the term 'nations of the world' experienced, from Gentiles to Gentile-Christians, many sayings and utterances of the scribes appear in a new light and contribute to our knowledge and grasp of the situation which arose between the Church and the Synagogue after the middle of the third century. A few examples may be brought forward in this connexion.

There is another contemporary preacher, who depicts in one of his sermons a most remarkable picture of the relation between the nations of the world and the Jews. If all the

nations of the world (he says) ‘gather to deprive Israel of the love of their Heavenly Father, they could not succeed.’ Further, if all the nations would say: ‘We give up all our wealth in order to do the law and all the observances,’ God would refuse such an offer on the part of the Gentiles. ‘Why dost Thou not accept us?’ God’s reply is: ‘For ye are sinners.’ ‘Have the Jews not sinned?’ retorted the Gentiles. These two points, first, that the Gentiles aspire to step into the place of Israel, and secondly, their willingness to accept the law with all the burden involved in such a resolution, could not have been simply a homiletical imagination or a mere pious desire, but was derived from actual life and reflects a spiritual movement among the Gentiles, which was not to be found among pagans, but only among members of the Gentile-Christian Church. For, even in the time of Chrysostom there lived many Christians in Antiochia who craved for the rites and ceremonies of the Jews in order to satisfy their religious longing for God, on account of which they were roughly handled by the eloquent Church Father. How much more is such a Judaizing movement likely and possible in the third century, before the Church became identified with Imperial Rome and had to pass through the trial of the Diocletian persecution? There are some indications that such endeavours on the part of the Gentiles were not altogether futile, as the previous teaching seems to imply, but actually succeeded in approaching the essential part of the law, the central doctrine of Judaism, by understanding and wisdom, knowledge and intelligence, through which qualities they attained perfect love of God.

These two divergent views speak eloquently for the division of opinion which existed among the spiritual leaders of the time. To the group of unfriendly scribes may be counted the author of the following homily, who records the desire of the Gentiles to join the Synagogue, saying: ‘We heartily are longing to join you and share all the good things ready

for you in the world to come.' The Jews answer them: 'We were persecuted, we suffered humiliation, many of our brethren were put to death for the sanctity of the divine name, and you bruise them on the heel,' i.e. you treat all these sufferings with contempt. R. Abbahu, who lived in a different environment preached: 'Let the Gentiles acknowledge Me and I will gladly receive them—says God.' In short, just as in the Church the inclinations and attitude towards the law and its binding force and its power of salvation were divided, so there existed among the Rabbis different views. In both camps the hostile party triumphed and their intransigence was the cause of great harm to the idea and progress of religious thought.

Numerous Haggadic teachings and sermons are at the student's disposal to verify this observation. Generally, however, the unfriendly views are paraded before the reader and the other side of the picture is entirely ignored. Writers on Rabbinic subjects, Jews and Christians alike, cannot too often be warned to have care in examining the origin of a statement about date and place before making sweeping generalizations in a dilettantish manner. The unfavourable sayings are often quoted while the views of the friendly and conciliatory party are ignored. Since these scholars and teachers differed in education and upbringing, experience and social standards, they could not help viewing such problems as the relation of Church to Synagogue, in various lights. R. Abbahu, for instance, whose name has already been mentioned, says: 'The nations of the world come to seek protection under the shadow of the Holy One Blessed be He, and they, in due time, become the mainstay of the community.' There is no nation nor country in the world, says another homilist, to which the Jews were not exiled and driven; and everywhere Gentiles joined their communities and attached themselves. A third teacher says to his audience: 'God said to the Jews, if ye do not spread the teaching of my Godhead among the Gentiles, I will

punish you in future on the day of Judgement for such a neglect of duty.' Judaism made great progress among Gentile-Christians and advanced immensely all over the Roman world. Who knows whether the Old Testament could not have influenced the Catholic Church to a much greater extent, if the compromise between the Church and the Empire had not checked this healthy development and *rapprochement* between the two branches of monotheistic religion, who believed in, loved and feared the God of Heaven and Earth, the Creator of All and Father of mankind. Rabbinic sources confirm that Gentiles were eager to bring their gifts to the synagogues, ornamenting them with lamps and candles, and other tokens of their religious zeal and fervour. Gentiles observed the Sabbath, frequented Jewish places of learning in order to study the law. It is, therefore, almost ridiculous, when a German scholar, Herman Usener, tells that the attachment of the Christians in Antiochia towards the Synagogue was due to the intrigues of Jewish doctors, who in that age, like later in the Middle Ages, induced their patients to live according to the Mosaic Law and practise 'incubation' in Jewish places of worship. No proof, except a German significant '*Zweifelsohne*' can be advanced for such a monstrous assertion. The Jewish doctors never mixed up their medical activities with their religious feelings; nor did the authorities of the Synagogue open the gates of their sanctuaries for magic or witchcraft. What neither John Chrysostom fathomed, nor Usener understood was that the Old Testament had still a particular charm and an eloquent message to large masses of Gentile-Christians!

A. MARMORSTEIN.

PRESIDENT JAMES MONROE AND HIS DOCTRINE

NOTHING has influenced the relations between Europe and the United States more than the political doctrine that takes its name from James Monroe, fifth President of the United States. That doctrine was laid down in a Presidential message. It set forth that the American Continents were henceforth not to be colonized by any European power, and that an attempt by any such power to extend its system to the American Continents would be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States. It further laid down that, if any of the governments established in North or South America should be interfered with, the United States would regard such interference as an unfriendly act. The Monroe doctrine was not aimed at Great Britain. If the United States, in its then state of military and naval strength, had tried to impose the doctrine by force on Great Britain it would probably have failed. It was directed against the Continental powers of Europe and issued with the approval of Great Britain. Indeed, the British statesman, George Canning, took so keen an interest in the promulgation of the doctrine that some have claimed that he was the real author of it.

It may be not uninteresting to say something of the President who gets the credit of being the author of the Monroe doctrine. He was a man of the most ordinary ability and the most commonplace character. He possessed no merits commensurate with the superiority he attained ultimately in his country. As one looks at his portrait, and notes his long, inanimate, dull looking face, one wonders how he could ever have been famous for anything that required brains. Yet his name stands out among those of the rulers of the United States as that of a great man. He obtained a fame and reputation to which his abilities and

personality never entitled him, and walks through the pages of history enjoying a credit he never deserved.

What kind of man was he, then, this James Monroe? Born in Virginia in 1758 he was the descendant of a Scottish soldier, named Andrew Monroe, who settled in Virginia in the middle of the seventeenth century. He went, in due course, to the famous College of William and Mary, but left it when the war between Great Britain and her colonies broke out, to join the insurgent army. He became a lieutenant in the Third Virginia Regiment, and in 1777 he was appointed aide to the American general, who, without right or justification, called himself Earl of Stirling, and was so called by the Americans.

While in the army Monroe made the acquaintance of the future President Jefferson. Jefferson was fifteen years older than Monroe, and was then beginning to play a leading part in the life of the nation. Monroe's new friend was an individual with many defects and shortcomings. He was not a man of the world, and was totally without military understanding. He inherited a taint of insanity as a family heritage, and was physically a coward. He was politically intolerant, and was absolutely lacking in the spirit of majority and minority compromise which is the basis of republican government. He was not eloquent, and lacked the physical qualifications of the orator. His voice, weak at best, became guttural and inarticulate in moments of excitement, and the consciousness of this infirmity made him refuse to risk his reputation in debate. He was seldom able to add up a column of figures correctly, and was for over fifty years of his life hopelessly insolvent. Yet this curious being, when the youthful Monroe made his acquaintance, showed promise of becoming and did ultimately become one of the greatest personages of American history.

In 1780 Jefferson sent Monroe to collect information with regard to the condition and prospects of the Southern army. This mission withdrew Monroe from service in the field,

much to his disappointment and chagrin. But his uncle, Judge Joseph Jones, a sagacious Virginian, advised him to cultivate the friendship of Jefferson. 'While you continue to deserve his esteem,' he said, 'he will not withdraw his countenance.' Monroe followed the advice of his uncle and became a close friend and follower of Jefferson. Jefferson ultimately gave his complete confidence and constant friendship to his young satellite. The friendship was of immense value to Monroe, and may be regarded indeed as the key to his ultimate success.

In 1788 Monroe married Elizabeth Kortright, a woman of Dutch descent and the daughter of a British officer. She was a first cousin of Mrs. Willing of Philadelphia, who was the mother of Lady Ashburton, the friend of Thomas Carlyle.

Monroe was chosen as a member of the Virginian convention that met at Richmond in 1788 to consider the ratification of the constitution that it was proposed to give the United States. The country was divided between two points of view about the constitution. One section of the people, who were known as the Federalists, were all for a strong central government, to which large powers should be given and to which the States should be subordinate. The other or Anti-Federalist section maintained that the States should come first and the central government should be secondary. Being mostly men of local influence, backed by the humbler classes, they struggled hard to maintain the supremacy of the provincial legislatures on which the popular voice could be brought to bear with most effect. The Federalists leaned towards aristocracy and England, the Anti-Federalists towards democracy and France. Washington and Alexander Hamilton were Federalists. Jefferson and Monroe were Anti-Federalists. Monroe opposed the scheme of a Constitution put forward by Washington and Hamilton, and put much venom into his opposition. He met all the attempts of the Federalists to organize a strong and efficient government with incredulity and hostile criticism.

In May, 1794, he was sent as envoy to France. In view of his opinions it was with great surprise that he found himself appointed to this office. His appointment was due to the desire of Washington to hold the balance equally between the two parties into which the nation was divided. Jay, who was a prominent Federalist, had been sent to England to negotiate a treaty with that country, which it was desirable not to offend. Monroe, an Anti-Federalist, and favourably disposed to France, was sent to Paris to promote friendly relations with the government in Paris. It was the wish of Washington to avoid a collision between the young American Republic and any foreign power, and his appointments were influenced by that wish.

Monroe arrived in France just after the fall of Robespierre, and escaped the horror and bloodshed which had made the stay of his predecessor, Gouverneur Morris, so dreadful. In the excitement of the period it was some time before he was officially recognized as representative of America. But in August, 1794, he was received by the French Convention, and addressed it in terms of such revolutionary enthusiasm that he called forth the censure of the authorities at home. President Theodore Roosevelt says that when Monroe succeeded Morris as envoy to the French, 'his capers were almost as extraordinary as their own, and seem rather like the antics of some of the early French commanders in Canada, in their efforts to ingratiate themselves with their Indian allies, than like the performance we should expect from a sober Virginian gentleman on a mission to a cultured nation.'

Monroe did not satisfy the American government by his conduct of affairs, and in August, 1796, he was recalled by Washington, who administered more than one scathing rebuke for his incompetence. His mismanagement was partly due to the fact that during most of the period of his mission Monroe was under the influence of Thomas Paine, who had become the venomous enemy of Washington.

When the Monroes first went to Paris in 1794 their daughter

Eliza became a pupil of the famous Madame Campan at St. Germain's and thus became friendly with the Bonaparte circle. Eliza knew Hortense de Beauharnais, afterwards Queen of Holland and mother of Napoleon the Third, and Pauline Bonaparte, afterwards Princess Borghese, and Caroline Bonaparte, afterwards Queen of Naples. She was also friendly with Miss Paterson of Baltimore, the first wife of Jerome Bonaparte, King of Westphalia. It was a curious fate that intertwined the life of the young Virginian girl from the Western republic with the lives of the Bonaparte princesses. But friendly as the imperial ladies were, their condescension had its limits. Once, when Eliza Monroe wanted an invitation to a ball given by Caroline at her château at Neuilly, Caroline refused on the ground that she, an Emperor's sister, could not receive the daughter of a republican.

Monroe was indignant at being superseded in Paris, and published in 1797 a pamphlet entitled, 'A View of the Conduct of the Executive,' in which he printed his instructions, his correspondence with the French and American governments, and letters from American residents in Paris. The publication caused great excitement, and made Monroe a hero among Anti-Federalists, with the result that he was elected Governor of Virginia.

In 1801 Jefferson was elected President of the Republic. One of the projects cherished by him was to purchase the large region beyond the Mississippi belonging to France and known as Louisiana. Robert R. Livingston, the American Minister in Paris, had been carrying on negotiations to that end and Jefferson in his anxiety to attain his object eventually sent Monroe to assist him. Livingston was extremely anxious to complete the negotiations before Monroe arrived and to get the credit of the transaction. He arranged the sale just in time to enable him to say 'without Monroe's help he had won Louisiana.' The purchase money was eighty millions of francs, and, when the bargain was made, Bonaparte said

exultingly: 'I have given to England a maritime rival that will sooner or later humble her pride.'

Monroe went from Paris to London, and subsequently to the Court of Spain. His object in Spain was to negotiate for the cession of Florida to the United States. He was not successful in this enterprise and returned to London. There with the assistance of William Pinckney, who was sent to help him, he concluded, after long negotiations, a treaty with Great Britain. The treaty failed to deal with two matters in which the United States was greatly interested, the impressment of seamen and indemnity for loss suffered by the Americans in the seizure of their goods and vessels. Jefferson was so disappointed that he would not send the treaty to the Senate. Henry Adams comments on Monroe's ill-success as a diplomatist. 'During a century of American diplomatic history,' says Adams, 'a minister of the United States has seldom if ever within six months, suffered, at two great courts, such contemptuous treatment as has fallen to Monroe's lot.' The truth was that as a diplomatist, the stupid Monroe was hopelessly outclassed by the acute and subtle statesmen of Europe. He was a child in the hands of Napoleon and Talleyrand in France, of Godoy and Cevallos in Spain, and of Castlereagh and Canning in England.

Monroe came back to America in 1807 as discredited as he had been on his return from Paris ten years before. Again he drew up an elaborate defence of his political conduct. Again, as after his recall in 1796, the discredited Monroe became a hero. He was elected for the third time to the Assembly, and in 1811 was chosen for the second time Governor of Virginia. In the same year, 1811, he became Secretary of State under President Madison and remained so till 1817. In June, 1812, war broke out between Great Britain and the United States, and from 1814 to 1815 Monroe acted as Secretary of War as well as Secretary of State. In 1816 he was elected President by a large majority of the electoral college.

Monroe, as President, is said to have endeavoured to imitate Washington in his habits and proceedings. He spent considerable time in 1817 and 1818 in making tours on the lines of Washington's progress in 1791. He was everywhere received with parades, addresses, applauding veterans, bells, fireworks, illuminations, receptions, reviews, inspections, entertainments. The unsympathetic Hale says: 'There is a little touch of burlesque when one reads that President Monroe arrayed himself in the old buff and blue of the Revolution with an old-fashioned three-cornered soldier's hat. There is just a touch of absurdity about this, because his military exploits were, of his whole life, the enterprises which his friends would have most gladly forgotten.' Hale quotes Aaron Burr, who in 1815 said that Monroe had never commanded a platoon nor was ever fit to command one. 'As Aide to the so-called Lord Stirling,' says Burr, 'Monroe's whole duty was to fill his Lordship's tankard and to bear with indication of admiration his Lordship's long stories about himself.'

In 1818 an agreement was made with Great Britain to limit the number of war vessels on the Great Lakes. Monroe's proclamation was issued on April 20, in that year. Here again the credit of this great and wise act was not primarily due to Monroe. In justice to Gallatin it should be said that it was he who made the first definite proposition of disarmament. In February, 1819, the purchase of Florida, which had long been desired by the United States, was at last accomplished. Through the negotiations of John Quincy Adams and Luis de Onis, the Spanish envoy, Florida was bought from Spain. The result was that the control of the entire Atlantic and Gulf seaboard from the St. Croix to the Sabine passed to the United States.

In 1821 Monroe was again elected President, only one vote being cast against him. On December 2, 1823, he sent his seventh annual message to Congress, in which he embodied the Monroe doctrine. The immediate cause of the enunciation of the doctrine was the rebellion of the Spanish colonies in

South America from Spain, and the threat of the absolutist governments of Europe to assist in subjecting them to their former masters. Monroe was such a dull, slow man that it is impossible to believe he could ever have been primarily responsible for so bold and incisive an act as the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine. The consequence is that credit for the policy embodied in the doctrine is given by weighty authorities to other and abler men.

Some historians attribute the doctrine to John Quincey Adams, Monroe's successor in the Presidency. Allan Nevins says of him, 'He was the chief author of the Monroe doctrine.' Elihu Root, so weighty an authority, holds the same view and regards Adams as the major force in formulating the doctrine. 'Monroe himself has long been judged as unlikely to take so extreme a stand in the face of allied Europe, for he was by nature a timid man, and was at the time in poor health.' President Angell, of Michigan University, expresses what he believes to be the truth in a picturesque figure. 'The great Secretary of State was able to inspire the slow-moving and lethargic President to fling out the challenge of 1823. . . . James Monroe held the trumpet, but John Quincey Adams blew the blast.'

Senator Sumner, the eminent statesman of the Civil War period, attributes the doctrine to the British minister, Canning. 'He was,' says Sumner, 'the inventor, promoter, and champion, at least so far as it bears against European intervention in American affairs.' Canning, who was opposed to the designs of the European powers for the restoration of the Spanish colonies to Spain, sought to enlist the United States in the same policy, and to induce them to join with Great Britain in a declaration. When Rush, the American minister in London, replied that any interference with European politics was contrary to the traditions of the American Government, Canning argued that such a policy was no longer applicable, that the question was as much American as European, that the United States was the first

power on the American continent, and ought not to look on with indifference while the fate of South America was decided by Europe. Monroe himself approved of joint action with Great Britain, but with the hesitation of a weak man, he consulted Jefferson and Madison as to the advisability of accepting the British proposal. Both of the older statesmen warmly approved, but Adams insisted that America should act alone. After much discussion, and a good deal of vacillation on the part of the President, the Cabinet at Washington at length accepted the lead of Canning, and the President enunciated the doctrine known by his name.

As President, Monroe was never tested by any difficulties that might have brought out the essentially mediocre nature of his abilities and character. Wealth and comfort were rapidly increasing with the development of the United States. In the last year of his first term he said: 'I see much cause to rejoice in the felicity of our situation,' and, when he entered on his second term, he dwelt on 'the prosperous and happy condition of our country in all the great circumstances which constitute the felicity of a nation.' Shepard, in his *Life of President Van Buren*, points out that Monroe was just what the people of the United States wanted. 'This modest, gentle ruler was in his very mediocrity agreeable to them,' he says. 'He symbolized the comfort and order, the supreme respectability of which they were proud.' There were no political storms or crises that might have shown how mediocre he really was. Monroe ceased to be President in 1825. Like Jefferson and Jackson, he was embarrassed in his circumstances in his later years, and spent much time in endeavouring to obtain from a stingy Congress a just reimbursement of expenses incurred by him during his services abroad. After a discreditable delay some allowance was made by Congress. He died in 1831.

In appearance, Monroe was about six feet in height and not handsome. He was broad, square-shouldered, and raw-boned. He was not cultured and had no versatility. His

conversational powers were dull and poor. He was not fluent, and was wholly wanting in imagination. He had an unoriginal mind, and had no sense of humour. He was not a good speaker. He was awkward and diffident and without grace in manner or appearance. 'To be plain,' said Wirt, 'there is often in his manners an inartificial and even an awkward simplicity.' Wirt adds that his attentions were never performed with the striking and captivating graces of a Marlborough or a Bolingbroke. This was fixing a very high standard.

As American Minister to Great Britain Monroe was like a fish out of water. In the brilliant society of the English Court, he was a dull and commonplace figure. The Whigs, however, were civil to him and he was fascinated, as everybody was, by Fox. Speaking of his first interview Monroe wrote that Fox 'in half an hour put me more at my ease than I ever felt with any person in office since I have been in England.' Lord Holland said of him: 'He was plain in his manners and somewhat slow in his apprehension, but he was a diligent, earnest, sensible, and even profound man.' This was all true except the profundity. Monroe, when in London in 1807, lived at 23 Portland Place.

If Monroe was not a great man, he had some good qualities. He was industrious and persevering, and had good sense and sound judgement. He was exemplary in private life. In his intercourse with his family he was not only unvaryingly kind and affectionate, but as gentle as a woman or a child. He was personally unselfish. The wishes, the feelings, the interests, the happiness of others, were always consulted in preference to his own. He loved his country and had a keen sense of duty. The success in life and the honours which he attained were granted to him because the people knew that, if he lacked greatness of intellect and force of character he was honest and upright and loved his fatherland.

J. A. LOVAT-FRASER, M.P.

Notes and Discussions

SOME CATHOLIC APOLOGIAS¹

THE title I have used is really a misnomer, since the most important of the three writers to whom I am going to refer would call himself neither a Catholic nor an apologist. Nicolas Berdyaev is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, one of the writers for whom the exaggerated ritualism that strikes the Protestant observer of its ceremonies, and the corruption and worldliness that have suffered so terrible a nemesis in Russia, do not exist. Instead, they are conscious of the golden chain that unites Christian thought as they understand it with all that is best in Greek thought, just as Elmer More held that the Greek fathers are the true descendants of Plato and the Neo-Platonists. It is this that makes Berdyaev shrink from the clean-cut definitions of what he calls Catholicism. God cannot be known by the natural light of human reason alone. The Church is not a body which can be estimated numerically; it is mystical and potential as well as actual; it cannot rest upon the papacy, 'a myth created in history by Western Christendom.' It rests upon the principle expressed by the untranslatable Russian word *sobornost*, which combines our ideas of community, society, and totality. The race is one, and therefore 'we must all be saved together,' and not in isolation. God and Christ are one, and Christ is one with man; God-humanity is the final truth of Christianity. Hence the Orthodox will always lay stress, not so much on grace and redemption as on faith in the resurrection, Easter and the transfiguration of the world.

In contrast to this, the author points out, is Protestantism with its revolt of man's subjectivity against the external authority of the Church? This means an individualism which is contrary to *sobornost*. But it is not confined to the followers of Luther. It is inherent in the Western Church. Here M. Berdyaev is undoubtedly correct. Salvation is a matter for the individual. A man must himself trust in Christ for his salvation. This M. Berdyaev would deny. Salvation is collective, he would say. We must be saved together—the whole of mankind, the whole universe. He can, it is true, point to the New Testament doctrine of the restitution of all things, or the summing up of all things in Christ. The mistake is to imagine that the two are contrary. The Christian who believes that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth may hold that at the last this purpose will be fulfilled; but even though mankind should be united as one great body to the Father in the Son, that body will

¹*Freedom and the Spirit*. By Nicolas Berdyaev. (Centenary Press. 1935). *Mirage and Truth*. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Centenary Press. 1935.) *The Unfinished Universe*. By T. S. Gregory. (Faber and Faber. 1935).

be made up of individual men and women who know the meaning of repentance and faith. The Protestant, however, would urge that in actual history he has been less of an individualist than the Catholic; for while to the Catholic the individual has simply to receive what the Church gives him and carry out obediently what the Church through the priesthood tells him to do, the member of a Protestant community, for whom there is no priestly order, has to play a responsible part in the life of his religious body as a whole. In fact, the Protestant comes nearer than the Catholic to the creative life of the spirit which is one of the most suggestive of the author's conceptions. Creation is opposed to humility. Humility is clearly the virtue of the Christian; but is it the only virtue? Is there nothing essentially Christian in the work of the artist, the poet, the musician? Creation has passed beyond the conflict with sin; it is the positive and inspired activity of the whole being; and as such it is religious. It does not neglect humility; it builds upon humility. In creation man reaches the level of God; God and man become one on the plane of the spirit. It is the doctrine of *sobornost* over again.

Here M. Berdyaev makes his protest against what he calls the monophysite-monist heresy; the belief that there is nothing in the world of existence but God, or, to state it in a different form, that the nature of God is one and not two—the God-man. Pantheism is a lie; the truth is in Panentheism: all things in God, or God in all. But this means an unfinished universe, as opposed to the finished universe of the Catholic conception. God and man alike are creating; the work of the spirit is not yet done. In fact, this inner kinship between the human spirit and the divine is the foundation of mysticism; mysticism is the overcoming of creatureliness; 'it is the way of deification for man and the world.' In this way the individual escapes from himself. 'I thank Thee O God that Thou who reignest over all, art now in very truth one spirit with me.' *Freedom and the Spirit* is a great and compelling book, and behind it lies the agony of one who had seen communism sweeping over the lands which, alas, had failed to comprehend Orthodoxy as the author understands it.

Equally attractive, though for different reasons, is the next work I mention; *Mirage and Truth*, by Father D'Arcy, one of the most learned and persuasive of Jesuits; and Father D'Arcy is of the West as M. Berdyaev is of the East. Turning his pages, we seem to be listening to eloquent preaching; but running through all is an exposition of the Catholic faith, of which the nerve, so to speak, is not the spirit of freedom, but of reason. Not that the author has in mind the school of thought of which M. Berdyaev is so adequate a spokesman; he is thinking of the cultured agnostics of our time who cannot believe in God. His arguments are not strikingly novel; he urges upon his adversaries the fallacy of agnosticism; 'you say that you cannot trust your reason; you trust it every moment of your life; why not go the whole way?' He claims that God alone satisfies our ideals; that is, without God, neither goodness nor beauty is intelligible, and asks us if we can really suppose that it is possible to get on without

belief in a first cause; here he is interpreting the ontological argument, or rather pulling into the light its one assumption. In doing this he is on the recognized lines of Catholic theology, which roundly condemns those who deny that God cannot be known by reason. In his chapter which deals with the Atonement, where the Church has committed itself to no definite view, he argues that God, in His dealing with man, takes man's way; and since man has always regarded sacrifice as the means to the surest reconciliation, God chooses sacrifice as His means for bringing man to Himself. 'Each man slays the thing he loves'; and Christ dies on the cross. In this way the Church makes its appeal to human reason; 'know thyself,' it says; and while it insists on its dogmas, clear and precisely formulated, it allows the 'mystic,' within the limits of those dogmas, of course, to use his own language and sing his own songs.

There is nothing here that could be called popish or Romanist; no reference to the power of the keys, the veneration of saints, whether St. Antony of Padua or St. Thomas More or St. John Fisher; nor is any thing like the Inquisition mentioned. There are certain subjects, very vital to the Catholicism of the Vatican, which it is as well not to refer to in books of this kind; and indeed in a work dealing with Theism, they would have been out of place. What the Protestant would miss is any recognition of the faith by which the sinner finds his way to his Saviour. The Church may be the repository of sound doctrine; or it may be the developing sphere where in creative activity the spirit unites man to God. But primarily, as every Protestant will assert, the Church is the Church of pardoned sinners. If we are saved by grace, it is through faith: the *fides qua creditur* rather than the *fides quae creditur*; that comes afterwards. Without this, Christianity is bound to become a thing of rites, creeds, and a hierarchy. Father D'Arcy is evidently quite happy in interpreting the Death of Christ, with so many others, as a sacrifice, a rite. Strange that he has forgotten that the New Testament writers hardly ever think of it as such; for them it is not the approach to an altar through a victim; it is the approach through a person to a person. It is not a dealing with a deity; it is the way by which a penitent sinner returns to his Father.

Very different is the third book before me, *The Unfinished Universe*; a definite attack on Protestantism by a young recruit to the Catholic faith. It is built up on a contrast so clear as almost for a time to carry conviction; the contrast between magic=science=philosophy =a block universe=Protestantism, and religion=priesthood=dogma =an unfinished universe=the Roman Church. These identifications are startling; indeed, the very assumption latent in the title of the book would surprise a Catholic; but the author courageously travels through all the territory of philosophy from the early Greek sophists onwards, and the whole of Church history, neatly labelling magician and priest alike. The range of reading, to judge from the proper names scattered over every page, is enormous; but the comments are constantly passing from the clever to the superficial and from the superficial to the

disingenuous. For instance, we are told that to Luther, 'to be disinterested was to be dishonest; outward behaviour was hypocrisy'; but later on, we are asked to believe that a cult of absolute honesty is *prima facie* evidence that its initiates are dishonest. It is of course natural for a young convert to outrun his new masters, and to see nothing but gold in his new home, nothing but dross in the pastures where he grew up. I understand that the book was finished while the author was still in the position of a Methodist minister. It is perhaps a little unkind to have referred to this offering of a *perfervidum ingenium* in company with such work as that of M. Berdyaev and Fr. D'Arcy; but if one would learn either the strength of the Roman position, or the courtesies of polemics, one must look elsewhere.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE.

'THE UNFINISHED UNIVERSE'

MR. T. S. GREGORY was preaching in Methodist pulpits in January last. His book was published by Faber & Faber on March 21. In it he defends the infallibility of the Pope; he attacks the principle of toleration; he condemns modern Protestantism, as 'magical,' man-centred, and a delusion, and compares both Protestant revivals and the preaching of experience to 'a gnosis preoccupied with human apotheosis rather than the divine Act.' This work has been coolly received in certain responsible weekly papers. It may forcibly be asked why this Quarterly should give an extended notice to it. The answer must lie, first, in the personal affection with which Mr. T. S. Gregory is regarded by many of his former brethren; and second, in the fact that his book is not an *apologia*, but an attempt at a religious philosophy in the form of an appeal to Methodists.

'As one born to heresy,' he says (p. 31), 'I have tried to show my fellows that parts of the faith which they vehemently or complacently reject stand in it not only by logical coherence, but as real instruments of that eternal mercy which brought God to earth.' Courtesy, to say nothing of any zeal for truth, seems to enjoin a close examination of a book with this proselytizing aim. Mr. Gregory has come out of the pulpit, where his message was wont to help many a soul, and he has entered on the terrain of scholarship, where no doubt he expects to drink delight of battle.

How then does Mr. Gregory deal with the chief stumbling-block of Protestants, the doctrine of an infallible Papacy? We turn to the crucial page (284) expecting an argument for 'logical coherence' and find straightway a pistol pointed at our poor heads. 'Papal authority rests on the word of Jesus and on nothing else. That is its strength. To discuss its title deeds, and to reach an independent decision either for or against the authenticity of His words to St. Peter, or St. Peter's occupancy of the Holy See, is *ipso facto* to deny the presence of divine authority here and now. . . .

The mind that accepts the fact' (that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God) 'independently of self-constituted approval, cannot raise the Protestant doubt.' As the reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* has already pointed out, this passage runs counter to the whole classical tradition of Roman Catholic apologetic. A genuinely Roman Catholic apologist would never dismiss the value of historical testimony in influencing the mind towards the assent of faith. But what becomes of the claim for 'logical coherence,' if the claim of the mind for historical evidence is so contemptuously dismissed?

An attempt to demonstrate 'logical coherence' is made elsewhere (p. 250). 'If Jesus is the incarnate Son of God, peculiar sanctity belongs to . . . the world which received Him from Heaven, and conditioned His life upon earth. Rome was more than the metropolis of that world.' After various historical statements clothed in rhetorical form, Mr. Gregory reaches his 'conclusion' (p. 251). Therefore 'Rome was the divinely appointed metropolis on earth.' If this means anything, it means that all men on earth must henceforth and for ever obey the Pope, because there was a Roman Emperor at the time of Christ. This argument is extraordinarily confused. In this very chapter the word 'Rome' is used with a variety of meanings; first, as the actual city in ancient times, next as the government of Augustus, then as a synonym for the persecuting Emperors, then as the whole system of non-Christian antiquity, then as the city in Dante's time, then as the head of a divine civilization, then as the See of Rome, then as 'the world of Jesus.' By jumbling up all these meanings Mr. Gregory may hypnotize some vague and unready minds, but the result of the jumble must not be called either argument or scholarship. Mr. Gregory has recently said in another journal: 'Methodism has a kind heart but a muddled head.' If his epigram contains the two sole and essential characteristics of Methodism, we may claim that the author of this book is still eminently qualified to minister amongst us.

It may well be asked whether all the book is of this disappointing calibre. An answer is difficult. The writer is as a rule inconsequent and obscure. His great gift is that of splendid declamation. Sentence after sentence of sonorous rhetoric rolls across the pages. No doubt Mr. Gregory has many of the preacher's gifts. He revels in epigrams, but they hardly ever bear close scrutiny, and they are usually obscure. He has warmth of feeling, but it is uncontrolled by any genuine intellectual power. He has read widely, and some of his quotations from the classics are delightful. But his theological scholarship is slight. He continually leaves awkward facts out of his argument. The book contains a lengthy array of statements which cannot be substantiated. Let us take three crucial examples.

(i). 'Luther conceived salvation always as a state of the individual soul. His egoism pervaded every part of his thinking and dominated every article of his belief.' This is untrue. Such a statement ought to be accompanied by an attempt at proof. To prove it, Mr. Gregory

would have to consider, and somehow get rid of, an immense catena of Luther passages, some of which are collected, for example, by Paul Althaus, *Communio Sanctorum* (Munich, 1929), where it is shewn how dominating the idea of the fellowship of believers is for Luther's thought. But none of the nine quotations from Luther which are given by Mr. Gregory suffices even to illustrate his mis-statement, let alone prove it. And singularly enough, though Mr. Gregory sprinkles references plentifully over his six pages of notes, no references whatever are given for the citations in the Luther chapter.

(ii) This example is glaring, but not isolated. In mentioning Calvin's 'political absolutism' Mr. Gregory says: 'Calvin was not concerned with Christ. His magistrate is the vicar of God.' 'The Calvinian theocracy banished Christ from the Church.' These sentences are not merely untrue. They are meaningless to any one who has read Calvin's *Institutes*. Here is a sentence from one of the main passages of that work, describing Calvin's doctrine of the Church. The Church 'is united with the stability of Christ, who will no more suffer his faithful people to be severed from him, than his members to be torn in pieces.' Yet Mr. Gregory dares to say that Calvin was not concerned with Christ! The Church is holy, says Calvin, because Christ hallows it, through the Word and Sacraments. But Mr. Gregory, ignoring chapter after chapter of Calvin's own work, says that 'Calvin was not concerned with Christ'! In an epigram (p. 175) he likens Calvin to Muhammed. 'There is no God, but God, and Calvin is the prophet of God.' This may sound clever to those who know little of Muslim theology and nothing of Calvin. But it is only ridiculous to those who know even the elements of both. Let one who is perhaps the greatest modern historian of dogma answer Mr. Gregory. As in his doctrine of the Trinity, 'so also in his Christology, Calvin reproduced 'the orthodox doctrine' (Reinhold Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. IV, p. 582). Indeed, in one of the weightiest of recent works on Calvin, Wernle maintains that the whole of Calvin's theology is Christocentric, because Calvin continually insists that only through Christ do we come to knowledge of God. Calvin, Seeberg and Wernle may say what they like, but Mr. Gregory asserts that 'Calvin was not concerned with Christ.' He goes on to say (p. 175) of Calvin's *Institutes* that they 'fashion a religion *de novo*, as if there had never been any religion before.' Calvin says that he accepts the Scriptures as the Word of God; he accepts the Creeds, and indeed the *Institutes* are an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. On the principle of discrimination laid down by St. Augustine, he accepts the authority of many great Church Councils (*Inst. iv. c. ix.*). Is this to 'fashion a religion *de novo*, as if there had never been any religion before'?

(iii) A third example of Mr. Gregory's disregard of the canons of genuine scholarship is his description of Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher 'reduced religion to human feeling' (p. 164). This mis-statement is essential to Mr. Gregory's main argument (p. 22), which will be discussed below. Schleiermacher in his greatest work, *The*

Christian Faith, did not reduce religion to human feeling. He defined religious feeling as absolute dependence. As Dr. Oman, our great Cambridge authority on Schleiermacher, has justly said:¹ 'this absolute dependence is really dependence on the Absolute'; it is dependence on God. Schleiermacher believed that the fact of redemption could only be explained by the fact of Christ. 'The advent of this unique and archetypal Figure . . . is due to a creative Divine act.'² This is not reducing religion to human feeling. Most modern students discover grave faults in the system of Schleiermacher, but the crudity of Mr. Gregory's statement is a further indication that he is unfamiliar with the work of the great thinkers whose names in his agile epigrams are so briskly tossed away into the air.

These examples of unsubstantiated dogmatism and inaccuracy have been chosen because they affect the main 'argument' of Mr. Gregory's book. He sets out to prove that the Hellenes were 'magicians,' that modern science is another form of ancient magic, and that *as the result of the Reformation*,³ Europe has returned to the mental habits of the Hellenes of old. Protestantism is like Hellenism in that man is the measure of all things. Its so-called religion is self-centredness. 'Egoism remains.' 'The heirs of the Reformation believe that man is God' (p. 319). 'Luther: triumphant egoism'—so runs one heading (p. 8). But the argument ceases to exist, unless, by patient citation of the sources, the author can prove the egoism of Luther, the self-centredness as well as the Christlessness of the religion of Calvin, the reduction of religion to human feeling by Schleiermacher—in short, the general 'egoism' of Protestant piety. It is significant that even Mr. Gregory cannot venture to assert of Calvin that the piety of the *Institutes* is centred in man rather than in God. Yet he would have to prove that assertion if he wishes to prove his main thesis. As it is he falls back on a travesty of the facts, and compares Calvinism with the unitarian theology of Muhammed. But Mr. Gregory never proves, he asserts. Unfortunately his assertions continually conflict with the facts.

There is a real charge against our beloved Methodism which lingers in the mind after this book has been read, re-read, and read yet again. It is contained in a sentence which Mr. T. S. Gregory has printed in another journal, since he was received into the Church of Rome. 'For myself, I was admitted into the ministry of the Methodist Church without five minutes' tuition of any kind.' This is a matter of repentance and of shame to us. We can certainly plead that such failures to provide theological education are rare, and that at the end of the war some irregularities were tolerated which are not likely to be tolerated again. Some who had then no personal responsibility in the matter, will promise to do their utmost henceforth to see that no clever young Oxford man with a Second or First in History or even 'Greats' comes into our ministry without that

¹ *Problem of Faith and Freedom*, p. 243.

² H. R. Mackintosh on Schleiermacher, in *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 253.

³ p. 18. The Italics are the reviewer's, cf pp. 22, 164, 166, 169.

theological discipline which Mr. T. S. Gregory has lacked. The whole book bears witness to that lack. For all the wide reading of its author, the book belongs to the *genre* of a Greats Essay. The epigrams are sometimes clever; but on such a theme and by such a man, mere cleverness ought to have been put away with the 'childish things.' That great Roman Catholic thinker, Friedrich von Hügel, would say in private to his friends: 'When I was young, I tried to be clever; now I pray hard not to be.'

Anatole France once wrote a story, *Le Jongleur de Notre Dame* (first translated by that saint and seer, Daniel de Mouilpied),—of the juggler who performed his art as his devotion before the image of the Blessed Virgin. But that story, charming and pathetic as it was, might be pathetic and disastrous, if instead of painted balls, the juggler were tossing into the air with bewildering dexterity those instruments of truth divine, even precious words.

R. NEWTON FLEW,
John Wesley's Day, May 24, 1935.

THE NEW TISCHENDORF

UNDER this brief title we hail the appearance of the first part of a work whose full-dress title deserves to be appended. *NOUUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: EVANGELIUM SECUNDUM MARCUM cum apparatu critico nouo plenissimo, lectionibus codicum nuper repertorum additis, editionibus versionum antiquarum et patrum ecclesiasticorum denuo inuestigatis edidit S. C. E. Legg, A.M. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano.* To this it is only necessary to add that the price is 21s. Three generations of scholars have used the eighth edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament with critical apparatus as the indispensable work of reference for variant readings. That great work had a notable history. The first edition appeared in 1840. Then Constantine Tischendorf, a young scholar without means but with boundless energy and courage, started off on that adventurous journey during which he deciphered the famous Paris palimpsest of the Greek Bible (Codex C) and discovered some fragments of the Sinaitic Codex with which his name will always be associated. The seventh edition appeared just before his final visit to Mount Sinai, so that the eighth edition, embodying the results of his momentous discovery in 1859, superseded all predecessors and rivals. But that crown of all his labours came from the Press in the years 1869–72. We have only to think of the vast accumulation of textual data since that time to recognize the need of a 'new Tischendorf.'

Early in the present century it was announced that the German scholar Hermann von Soden, aided by an army of assistants, was to produce the longed-for Greek Testament with full critical apparatus. Three huge volumes of Prolegomena were published between 1902

and 1910. At last in 1913 the final volume came out. The worst fears were realized. Apart from the charge of unreliability in matters of detailed accuracy which some critics have made, the apparatus was doomed to failure from the start. In an attempt to simplify the notation von Soden invented a crazy system of his own which made the critical apparatus almost unusable. The present writer has found his temper sadly ruffled so often when consulting this volume that it was an immense relief to learn from one of the greatest living textual critics, as far famed for his piety as for his learning, that he could not use the book!

The complete failure of von Soden to replace Tischendorf made the need of a new effort only the more urgent. Soon after the war an appeal was made for funds so that a committee of British scholars might be encouraged to start on the work. A committee was soon formed, with the Bishop of Gloucester as chairman, upon which such experts served as Sir Frederic Kenyon, Dr. H. J. White, Professor A. Souter, Professor F. C. Burkitt and Canon B. H. Streeter. Mr. S. C. E. Legg was appointed Editor. From time to time subscribers to the fund have wondered whether the scheme had collapsed for want of sufficient support.

Now at last the first instalment has been issued, and it is a sight to gladden the heart of every Biblical scholar. The Clarendon Press has not only made a generous grant towards the cost, but has also lavished the utmost care upon the typography. In the Latin preface signed by the Chairman and Professor Souter, thanks are rendered to the British Academy, the British and Foreign Bible Society, many of the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges, as well as to the Clarendon Press.

One question was keenly debated when the governing principles were being laid down. What text was to be printed at the head of the page? Some argued that the *Textus Receptus* should be used, as the variations from this would be supported by a minority of authorities, weighty as they might be in themselves. But Robertson Nicoll's fatal blunder in following that method in the first two volumes of the *Expositor's Greek Testament* must have served as a warning. However clearly it may be laid down that the printed text is not a standard to be followed, but a text with which the variants are to be contrasted, possession is after all nine points of the law. In the end it was resolved to print the Westcott and Hort text as the best critical text so far printed, and to indicate the variants with a full *apparatus criticus*.

This first instalment is a handsome volume containing the Gospel according to St. Mark. There are various reasons why this volume should appear first. We need only refer to the minute care that has been devoted by a group of scholars on the other side of the Atlantic to the readings which constitute the 'Caesarean Text' of this Gospel. The book is furnished with a catalogue of symbols, and a terse description of each manuscript. The uncials come first, and the use of the Hebrew letter *lamed* is a convenient sign for the consensus of eleven of the later uncials. For the uncial fragments Gregory's

symbols are given with the older notation of Tischendorf in brackets. Happily the long delay in the publication of the work has enabled the Editor to make full use of the Chester-Beatty papyri, which supply third century readings for fourteen passages in St. Mark. The minuscules (grouped, where possible, in families) and the versions are also drawn upon to the full extent of modern knowledge of them. Biblical quotations from the early Fathers are printed at the foot of the page.

The great value of such a compendious work as this must not be judged by the number of students who can afford to buy it, or even of those who will use it. In the nature of the case it is a standard work of reference to be found in libraries. But no Greek Testament scholar engaged in the careful study of the text can afford to ignore it. His gratitude to those learned men who have toiled to produce it will indeed be great. Moreover all good patriots will rejoice to think that Biblical scholarship in this country is maintaining the great tradition of Brian Walton and Richard Bentley, of Holmes and Parsons, of Tregelles and of Westcott and Hort, of Hatch and Redpath, of W. F. Moulton and Geden, of Milligan and J. H. Moulton, of Wordsworth and White.

We shall now eagerly await the remaining parts which Mr. Legg and his band of expert colleagues are to produce with the aid of the Clarendon Press.

W. F. HOWARD.

THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED FRAGMENT OF TATIAN

Two years ago, while excavations were being carried out at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates, under Professor Clark Hopkins of Yale University, a small piece of parchment was dug up, which has an importance altogether out of relation to its size. Sometime in the early part of the Third Century it must have been crushed in the hand and thrown away as a piece of waste paper. Then it must have been dumped into a great embankment of earth, ashes and rubbish, which the Roman garrison constructed to protect the inner face of the city wall about the year A.D. 255. It was protected from damp by the material surrounding it, by the mud bricks that covered it, and by the desert sand that afterwards covered the whole city. Now, at last, after 1,680 years, it has come to light, and is attracting widespread attention. For it is a small fragment of a copy of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in Greek.

Tatian, the convert and disciple of Justin Martyr, somewhere about A.D. 172 returned from Rome to his native Mesopotamia, where he compiled a harmony of the Four Gospels, which, in its Syriac form, enjoyed a wide circulation in those eastern regions where Syriac was the medium of Christian instruction. Yet strangely enough the *Diatessaron* is only accessible to us in quotations in the Syrian Church Fathers, and in Arabic, Latin and medieval Dutch translations. Ever since the discovery of the old Syriac text of the Gospels a

controversy has been waged on the question whether Tatian's Harmony was published originally in Greek or in Syriac. Here at last is a fragment which proves that in Mesopotamia itself the *Diatessaron* was extant in Greek at the latest some eighty years after the probable date of its compilation.

Those who wish to know all that can be known about this precious fragment of parchment must secure *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura*, edited with Facsimile, Transcription and Introduction by Carl H. Kraeling, Ph.D. (London, Christophers, 7s 6d.). It appears as No. 3 in the series, 'Studies and Documents,' edited by Kirzopp and Silva Lake. Dr. Kraeling is already known by his editing of the posthumous book of his predecessor, Professor B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. His scholarly edition of this fragment is all that such a treatment should be, and worthily represents the highest traditions of the best American scholarship (than which there could be no higher praise).

This small piece of heavy parchment, about $9\cdot5 \times 10\cdot5$ cm. in size, contains some fifteen narrow lines, corresponding pretty closely to the contents of Luke xxiii. 49b, 50, 51, 54. The text is written in a good book-hand, which clearly belongs to the first half of the Third Century. Recent archaeological research at Dura has shown that between A.D. 220 and 235 a wealthy property owner turned part of his residence into a Christian chapel, which was subsequently pulled down when the embankment was constructed. The fragment was found in that rampart less than two hundred yards from the site of that chapel. Dr. Kraeling thinks that this copy of the *Diatessaron* was made in the scriptorium at Edessa to be used in this chapel at the time when it was built.

On the vexed question of the original language of the *Diatessaron* nothing decisive can be expected from so tiny a fragment. But Dr. Kraeling's judgement is based upon two main considerations. First, recent discoveries at Dura show that Greek was an immensely important vehicle of intercourse in a region where so many nationalities were represented. Secondly, a close comparison of this text with that of the Greek Gospels favours the conclusion that Greek was the original language of the Tatian's Harmony.

W. F. HOWARD.

HUMANIST AND CHRISTIAN: MUST THEY ALWAYS QUARREL?

BETWEEN the Christian and the Humanist view of life a great gulf is fixed. Is there any way of bridging it? Such a bridge is one of the major needs of civilization. A book was recently published which set out the differences between Humanism and Christianity, and ended by saying that on their own showing the two views of life were eternally incompatible. Among the letters the author received was one from a Christian priest. He agreed with the diagnosis, but,

he said, as he read the book he kept two Humanist friends in mind. His letter ended : 'I think the book would have been better for them if it had indicated just where at the present time an alliance was desirable.' As Christians and Humanists between them include a large proportion of the people working for sanity in a demented world, there is no doubt of the desirability of such an alliance. But it must not be the kind of alliance which is made by a sentimental attempt to pretend that inconvenient facts and principles have ceased to exist. The gulf between the two must remain until one converts the other; but meanwhile is it possible to throw a bridge over it?

In spite of the antithesis separating Christianity from Humanism there is one article of faith which both passionately hold. It is the dignity and the supreme value of human beings. True, they arrive at this point by quite different journeys, but they both get there. Both are individualists in the best sense of that much abused term. For them, value resides in the individual life, and not in the herd; and the single life is always greater than the common life of which it is a part. Lord Russell and the Archbishop of Canterbury have at least this much in common that they are bound to fight the philosophy of Caiaphas, 'It is expedient that one man should die for the people that the whole nation perish not.' Their presuppositions are wholly different, but Caiaphas denies them both.

The field of social betterment is one which at once occurs as likely ground for united action. As both believe in the absolute value of every human life, both are affronted by a system which inflicts suffering and mental or spiritual impoverishment on the poor in the interests of its own continuance. Could they not combine in this field? At first sight there would not seem to be any clear reason against such an alliance. But already one party to the prospective alliance seems to be drawing in its skirts from the other. Professor Julian Huxley recently said : 'We are witnessing the dawn of a struggle not between science and religion, but between the God-religious and the social-religious.' His distinction is certainly real. It rests upon the difference—even the opposition—between the ends to which Christianity and Humanism point. The Christian undertakes social welfare work because the present conditions make it needlessly difficult for multitudes to respond fully to the offer of eternal life and to partake of the joys of the worship of God. The Humanist undertakes it because the stultification of so many holds up the glorious Kingdom of Man. The difference in aim necessarily involves a serious difference in method, which Professor Huxley realized. An alliance in the field of social reform is likely to be shortlived. For it is to propose a working concordat in the very field where the essential and inescapable differences will most swiftly become apparent. Social reform is a field large enough for both, but it will be better tilled if Christian and Humanist work side by side than if they sit on the same committee.

There is, however, one field in which both sides can work together

in complete harmony, in their opposition to the fashionable craving for dictatorship, by whatever name it may be called. For Fascism, whether according to the German, Russian, or Italian model, is a deadly heresy to both, and they can join hands to extirpate it. The omnicompetent or the corporative State rests on the principle that the whole is greater than the part, that crimes may be committed against the individual if it be for the good of the State. The State or the corporation is erected as an end in itself, and even, as in Germany, as an object of worship. For this reason dictatorships can never advance a step without cruelty and tyranny in the ruthless crushing of minorities; and what Caiaphas said yesterday Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini are all saying now. Humanist and Christian alike are bound to be totally opposed to such a philosophy, and to regard this devaluation of personality as the root heresy, for it strikes at the foundation of everything that both of them believe. It is noteworthy that the most effective protests against the Nazi régime have come from just these bodies. The resistance of Christians in Germany, both Roman and Protestant, and the unceasing protests of Humanists in Europe, in which many Christians have joined, have probably done more than anything else to stay Juggernaut's course. Both parties took their stand largely on instinct, and by so doing revealed a common ground for action.

Another ideal which Humanists and Christians hold in common, though again for quite different reasons, is civilization. Lord Russell said the other day: 'The educational machine throughout Western civilization is dominated by two ethical theories—that of Christianity and that of nationalism. The conception which I should substitute as the purpose of education is civilization.' The Christian may certainly agree in regarding nationalism as a common danger, but in no sense is it true that his goal of a divine kingdom makes him relatively indifferent to the progress of civilization. Further, he will be more likely to agree with the Humanist than with the Plain Man upon a theory of what civilization is. Mr. Clive Bell wrote a book to show that civilization is 'a high state of civility.' He meant something more than courtesy, though of course he included it. Civilization and courtesy are incompatible. Now a high state of civility is plainly an essential preliminary to any realization of the dignity and greatness of the human life; and it alone provides the security of tenure and equality of opportunity without which neither Utopia nor the *CIVITAS DEI* can be brought to birth. Civilization is vital to the continuance of Christianity and Humanism alike, and co-operation in its furtherance is another field where joint adventure may be expected to yield fruit.

No co-operation, however, can long exist when either party to it does not display to the other the high civility or courtesy which he seeks to commend to the world. Christians should realize that the Humanists are nearly all men of exalted minds, all of whom are spending themselves in the service of their day and generation. Their intrinsic nobility is not denied by the fact that they call darkness

that which to the Christian is light. The Christian can realize this and gladly acknowledge it without in the least denying the truth he himself sees. But the Humanist is not guiltless of courtesy. It is really time that he tried to understand that Christians are not in fact a set of ignorant and superstitious fanatics, and time, also, that he set himself to see what there is to be said for the faith they profess—a task which few Humanists have yet attempted to discharge. Such mutual civility and courtesy are the essential conditions of fruitful co-operation. On them alone can a bridge be built.

ROGER B. LLOYD.

A NEW CRITICAL APPROACH TO THE GOSPELS

THE name of Dr. Martin Dibelius, the distinguished Heidelberg Professor, is peculiarly associated with that modern and interesting development of New Testament criticism known as *Formgeschichte*. His last book has been translated into English by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf under the title *From Tradition to Gospel*, (Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Ltd., 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Woolf has unquestionably rendered a great service to English students by undertaking this work. His version is close and accurate, in the places where I have compared it with the original, and perhaps that is all that one ought to demand of the translator of a volume like this. But it does not read easily. A little more elasticity in the rendering would have improved it as an English book.

In the last number of this journal there was a valuable article by Dr. Vincent Taylor dealing at large with the work of Professor Dibelius and the whole question of *Formgeschichte*. The following paragraphs were written before I had seen this article, and I have let them stand unaltered.

I have no claim to be regarded as a New Testament scholar, but I have paid some attention for years past to questions connected with the transmission of tradition, and perhaps an interested outsider's view on *Formgeschichte* may be worth giving.

It seems to me, then, first of all, that the method of *Formgeschichte* criticism is a valuable one, and that it promises interesting results in the future, though the ground will need to be worked over carefully, again and again. There can be no doubt that in his underlying principle Dr. Dibelius is right. That is to say, the first factor in giving form to the materials we have in the Gospels was a practical and popular one. The Gospels were not compiled on the lines on which a modern historian or a modern biographer would work, and they are not either literary productions or historical records in the precise sense. The material which they contain took shape, first of all, as matter of propaganda. The first preachers of the Gospel had to have brief statements of our Lord's words and deeds which they could learn and remember and repeat to their hearers. Hence the forms in which the various sayings and stories were first embodied, and in which the compilers of the

canonical Gospels largely found these things. Now this is a striking and important fact, and if the particular patterns can be detected and classified and compared, in the way that Dr. Dibelius attempts, the process is bound to be most illuminating in its bearing on the way that the matter of the Gospels originated and developed.

But behind this there is another fact, and one more primary and more significant, to which I think Dr. Dibelius hardly does justice, at least in some connexions. Apart from the evangelical experience there would have been no evangelical records. That statement looks, and indeed is, elementary enough. But it conditions everything else. If men had not actually found God and found redemption in Christ no one would have bothered to memorize or write any records of what He had said and done, and the New Testament would never have existed at all. This fact is clearly recognized and stated by Dr. Dibelius at the end of the book, where he says that 'there was never a purely historical (*rein geschichtliches*) witness to Jesus. . . . What founded Christianity was not knowledge about a historical process, but the confidence that the content of the story was salvation.' But one would think that this ought to qualify considerably all that is said on pp. 267-8 and elsewhere about the Christ-mythology in Paul. A story the essential content and significance of which is salvation cannot be the story of a merely human personage living a merely natural life, and when once the superhuman and supernatural is involved what Dr. Dibelius calls the *Christus-Mythus* has already begun. After that details do not matter supremely. As Ninon de l'Enclos said, *Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte*.

I am a little suspicious both of the precision of Dr. Dibelius's classification, and of the way that he works it out. It is more than doubtful whether one can clearly distinguish all the matter dealt with into sermons, paradigms, tales, legends, analogies, and so forth. Why should a sentence be arbitrarily lopped off the end of a tale, for example, on the ground that it is not story but doctrine? Many a story does naturally end in a moral, and is naturally related in that form. And he is a bold man who undertakes to decide readily where a story of fact merges into a legend, or to deny offhand that a particular legend contains a core of fact. I wish the outlines were rather more vague, and the decisions rather more hesitant.

It is very doubtful too whether Dr. Dibelius allows sufficiently for another factor—the brief lapse of time in which the whole development of *Formgeschichte* had necessarily to come to pass. As he himself says, the whole process of developing the evangelical tradition as far as the Gospel of Mark took place within some forty to forty-five years. Now that is no very long period. It is a space of time well within the personal recollection of an elderly man. Moreover, within that period there was almost certainly some reduction of oral tradition to writing, in Q and Ur-Mark, at least. This leaves very little space for any very wide disparity or any very marked development in the traditional material. It is less than a third of the time that has elapsed since the death of John Wesley until now, and that

is far too short a period to admit of any very extensive growth, either in the legendary or the doctrinal tradition. I should say that it rules out absolutely the influence of Buddhist legends, for example.

Another point on which I feel dubious is the very sharp distinction drawn between the Hellenistic tradition received by Paul, and the Palestinian tradition. Dr. Dibelius says that Jerusalem, which Paul only rarely and briefly visited as a Christian, 'may be left out of account' as the place where he received the traditions adduced in 1 Cor. xi and xv. But surely even a single visit of a few hours' duration would have been sufficient to acquaint the Apostle with the main line of tradition held in the Church there?

Again it is argued that our Lord's words about faith in Mark v. 36 and Mark ix. 23 do not mean the faith which the Apostles preached to the churches, but merely a belief in Jesus as a thaumaturge. But a distinction like this is far too sharp, and at the same time, far too subjective. We feel that it is psychologically true when we read, as in Luke v. 8, for example, of an awed belief in our Lord's power to do signs passing into a faith and devotion fixed upon His Person, with at least all the elements of the redemptive experience in it. Dr. Dibelius seems to admit almost as much in this example, when he deals with it on p. 115.

Still, when all this is said, the book treats of the most original and suggestive movement in the criticism of the New Testament that has appeared for many years past, and it will certainly lead the way to valuable results in the days to come.

HENRY BETT.

BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

THE work of Professor Bergson, which has greatly influenced twentieth century thought, is now nearing completion. It has been accomplished steadily through half a century, and at each step speculation has been lively about its bearings upon practical as well as religious questions. It has been seized upon by syndicalists and militarists as lending support to their policies of direct action, whilst religionists have played with the notion that Bergson's Jewish blood might lead him to support the God of his race. The Roman Catholic Church has placed his first three books upon the *Index*, Protestants have mostly fought shy of his support, and philosophers have been divided between those who regard him as anti-scientific, and so far reactionary, and those who see in him a revolutionary. Yet there have been continuity and harmony right through his philosophy, though in accordance with his own doctrine he would not anticipate the findings of future inquiries. Hence the interest of his present work¹ consists largely in disclosing the personal beliefs of the author, which turn out to be none of the positions expected but to be akin to those of the great Christian mystics.

¹ *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Macmillan, London, 1935. pp. viii, 278, 10s. net.

The Two Sources rests upon the favourite Bergsonian opposition between intelligence and intuition. Intelligence, which tends to repetition, routine, uniformity, is the mother of static religion; it leads to closed societies dominated by habit, custom and social pressure. In self-defence against the disorganizing effect of clashing societies—for natural man is bounded in his love by his loyalties to fixed societies—fantasy produces myths which are of the nature of assurances against evils like the fear of death and the chances of the future. Hence arises the rich mythology of the religions, and also the rationalization of them by the theologians in their doctrines. This last yields the natural theology of the reason, apparently much the same in all the advanced religions, but belonging to the sphere of belief which is static. Myth-making and intelligence thus counteract and nullify each other in that rational creature, man, and ensure his balance in dealing with Nature. A sketch of the history of religions is given by Bergson in order to show that the maintenance of this balance is the function of social religion, which is, however, not religion in its purity but only in a mixed condition. True religion is intuitive and mystical.

Dynamic religion is primarily the achievement of heroes who open the way to new heights of experience, from which they descend to act upon the masses with boundless love. Eastern mysticism seems to have got entangled in dialectics and quietism, Greek mysticism was side-tracked by rationalism, but various currents came together in the Middle Ages and produced Christian mysticism—the complete form. ‘The ultimate end of mysticism is the establishment of a contact, consequently of a partial coincidence, with the creative effort of which life is the manifestation. This effort is of God, if not God himself. The great mystic is to be conceived as an individual being, capable of transcending the limitations imposed upon the species by its material nature, thus continuing and extending the Divine action.’ The prophets of Israel were not mystics, but they led the way to that mysticism of action of which Christ was the prince. The essence of this dynamic mysticism is the assertion that God is love, and the object of love. It is exhibited in creative energy, it produces finite creators, it tends to renew humanity by creative evolution; this opens the doors of the future, so that survival of death becomes possible, as both psychical research and mystical ecstasy combine to affirm.

There can be no doubt of the affinities of this philosophy with religion, even with Christianity. That it has been reached independently by a pure philosopher, working mainly upon scientific and historical evidence, makes it all the more impressive. Doubtless it falls short of a theology, and there are many points where one would like to see gaps filled in and emphasis altered. M. Bergson himself does something to soften the antitheses between intelligence and intuition, between the social and the mystical. Criticism will be directed nevertheless upon the treatment of Christianity as primarily mystical. Traditional theology has regarded it as essentially rational, and its morality as social. It will be rather surprising if Rome does not put *The Two*

Sources upon the Index. It will find itself in good company, and Rome has recanted before now. The mystical tradition in Europe is strong and is at present reviving; its union with an activistic and optimistic philosophy is a good omen for the world, which sadly needs a religious philosophy. The many suggestions which M. Bergson gives, of the way in which his view might be applied to benefit civilization, are worthy of prolonged thought and of vigorous adoption. For ourselves, after half a lifetime of study of modern thought, we can find little to recommend so enthusiastically, though not uncritically, as M. Bergson's deep and brilliant philosophy.

ATKINSON LEE.

REUNION FROM THE METHODIST POINT OF VIEW

To Methodists the question of Reunion with the Anglican Church presents no difficulty in respect of three of the four essentials laid down by the Bishops in their Lambeth Appeal of 1920 as the basis of a reunited Church. Indeed, the statement of beliefs to be mutually and whole-heartedly accepted regarding the Bible, the Creeds and the Sacraments is almost interchangeable with the statement of the Doctrinal Standards of the Methodist Church as these are set forth in the recently enacted Deed of Union.

Nor is there, from the Methodist point of view, anything objectionable in the fourth condition of reunion as that is stated in the Appeal. Here it is. 'We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of'—so runs the preamble—'a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.' The Anglicans believe that. Well, so do the Methodists. And, what is more, they both at present put their belief into practice in their respective Churches.

For confirmation of this statement, so far as the Methodists are concerned, the reader is referred to the Deed of Union where he will find Methodist Doctrine concerning the Ministry fully set out in a lengthy paragraph for which no better brief summary could be used than this formula of the Bishops. In respect of acknowledgement, call, commission and authority it most aptly describes the Methodist Ministry. And this Ministry the Methodist Church has created for itself, out of its own resources, in accordance with its claim to be within and a part of the Holy Catholic Church which is the Body of Christ. It regards this Ministry as valid for itself, and valid also, in all essentials, for the Universal Church. If, as Anglicans believe and Methodists would concede, the Anglican Ministry is valid for the Anglican Church so also is the Methodist Ministry valid for the Methodist Church, whilst for the Universal Church one is no less valid than the other. In any proposal of reunion between them this equality of essential validity ought therefore to be fully and frankly recog-

nized by both Churches. But is it? By the Methodists, yes; but what of the Anglicans?

It would seem that recognition is given by them and put beyond question in the Appeal itself and in subsequent Conferences with Free Church representatives. The Bishops admit the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate and thankfully acknowledge that they have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of Grace and that they are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. But these admissions which by themselves look so promising for reunion on a mutually satisfactory basis belong to a context of contention for the Episcopate as 'the one means of providing' for the reunited Church the ministry described in the formula, and their promise dwindles as the contention proceeds. The hope is expressed that ministers who have not received it would be led to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. Afterwards in Conferences this hope stiffened into a rigid insistence by the Bishops that there was no hope of any one being allowed to exercise his ministry amongst Anglican members of a reunited Church who had not been episcopally ordained. And there at present the question of reunion stands, the Anglicans determined that the reunited Church shall be episcopal and its ministers episcopally ordained while the ministers of the non-episcopal Communions among whom are the Methodists are given the task of determining whether they will or they won't be re-ordained by a Bishop for the sake of a reunited Christendom. Here, indeed, is difficulty.

In the meantime the non-episcopal Churches may well ponder the significance of this insistence upon the Episcopate as being the one means of providing the ministry for a visible and united Christendom. Their view of the Ministry being what it is, Methodists, at any rate, must be and, no doubt, will be alert to any tendencies in reunion proposals which are a denial of their avowed convictions and a drift away from the genuinely Protestant conception of the ministry toward the Roman. When, therefore, in reunion proposals the re-ordination of non-episcopal ministers is insisted upon by an episcopal Church whose ministry is already suspect in this matter of a Romeward tendency and whose ministers are divided into the High Church and the Low, the Romish and the Protestant, and can pass quite easily from one position to the other according to their interpretation of the same episcopal order which visibly unites them, Methodists may well consider the question of reunion from the point of view of tendencies, asking not only why there should be this rigid insistence upon the re-ordination of non-episcopal ministers but also whither such insistence is likely to lead.

Existing Churches may be divided broadly into two groups according to the relative importance they attach to authority and the Spirit. On the one side are the Churches which place the emphasis on authority and value the Spirit only as by it they can establish and

expand authority. On the other side stand the Churches which rank the Spirit above authority and value authority only as it secures the supremacy of the Spirit. And these two groups of Churches are for ever gravitating toward widely separated centres, a fact which becomes obvious whenever union between the groups or between parts of them is thought of. Of all the religion which leans upon external authority the presumptive heir is Rome. She is the centre toward which that type of religion inevitably tends. She is the fountain-head at which men will satisfy their craving for an external and visible authority in matters of faith and conduct if ever that craving takes possession of them. And if episcopal ordination be really essential to the Christian ministry why not seek the Roman? Of episcopal ministries Rome, so she boasts and not without grounds, has got the genuine thing. Indeed, from her point of view, the Anglican episcopacy is imperfect and the validity of Anglican orders is not admitted. Consequently, there have been Anglican ministers who became gravely concerned about this and sought the Roman ordination to end their restlessness whilst even non-episcopal ministers, infected with this fever, have been known to disdain calling at the half-way house of the Anglican order and to go directly, completely and finally to the Roman. Such is the alluring attraction of Rome for those who in religion put the emphasis upon external authority.

But there is another possible centre for Church union. The Churches which rank the Spirit above authority would say that Jesus Christ has for them abolished all authority in religion but His own; that His appeal is to the soul's experience of God; that the soul's experience of God is its own authority; and that they as Churches stand by God and the soul and the unique Personality who mediates God to the soul. For such Churches, the Methodist being one, union has its centre in Jesus Christ, a centre as truly spiritual as the other is formal, and as naturally unifying as the formal is divisive. Indeed, the spiritual union of all sincere believers in Christ is already accomplished. It has not waited for the slow movement of Church organizations. But when these do show signs of moving, and in this direction, every care must be taken in proposals of reunion to work the spiritual elements of the Christian religion so far free from the formal that the spiritual may unite those whom the forms have divided, and if necessary make new channels for itself where before none existed. Moreover, when Church organizations show signs of moving toward some measure and form of reunion it is necessary to make sure that behind the movement as the cause of it there is this spiritual union in Jesus Christ demanding a fuller and worthier expression of itself as a visible reality in human life and history.

When in connexion with any proposed reunion of the Churches, however, the emphasis which ought always to be put upon the Spirit is seen to be transferred to form; and when, as in the case of the Anglicans, their particular form of ordination is pressed to the point of denying, by implication, the essential validity of non-episcopal orders, it may well be doubted that here the tide of the Spirit is on

the move. Here one suspects the presence of the ancient tendency and mistaken emphasis. Here is visible unity dependent less on Spirit and more on form. Here, the Spirit, instead of being worked free from form, is worked into form and made almost a matter of form.

But this need not surprise when it is remembered that the two tendencies already mentioned are present and at work within the one Anglican Communion. They divide that Church into High and Low and on the question of the Episcopate they divide its ministers, some holding tenaciously to its historic character and to the theory of Apostolic Succession while others disbelieve that theory as unprovable and give their support to the episcopal form of Church government and order solely on the grounds of utility and expediency. And these two tendencies are revealed even in the Lambeth Appeal.

That Appeal, on the face of it, looks like an approach from the Low Church point of view. Its admissions respecting non-episcopal ministries are Low Church, not High. But later, in debate, the mask comes off and the High Church face is seen. 'Consideration of history,' a phrase by which in the Appeal the claim for the Episcopate is justified, turns out to be but another way of writing that blessed word 'Historic.' The old idea remains. It is the Anglo-Catholic idea which in essential particulars is that of the Roman Catholic Church. The Episcopacy is indispensable to the very being of the Church. It is of divine origin and authority. The bishops are the immediate successors of the Apostles. In their consecration a special grace is imparted to them and they alone have the right to ordain and thus confer an indelible grace. No ministry of different ordination is valid. So therefore, non-episcopal ministers must be re-ordained to make their ministry valid and possible of acknowledgement by Anglican members of the re-united Church.

If, from the High Church point of view, there is no alternative to rigid insistence upon the re-ordination of non-episcopal ministers, then for Methodists there seems to be no alternative to refusal of this condition of reunion. It is not the insistence in itself that makes refusal inevitable; it is the reason of it, the view behind it and, not least, the tendency revealed in it that create for Methodists conditions impossible of acceptance. It has been thought by some that of non-episcopal ministers the Methodist might find less difficulty than others in accepting re-ordination. Was not the founder of Methodism an ordained clergyman of the Church of England, and is not Methodism combined with the Episcopacy in America? The fact of Wesley's Anglican ordination has no real relevance to the problem. He was ordained for the Church of England, not for Methodism, and he applied in vain to the Bishop of London to ordain preachers for America. Ordination therefore had to proceed without the Anglican bishops. Wesley himself ordained Coke. He ordained him as the first 'superintendent.' Coke afterwards assumed the title 'bishop.' So began the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. Obviously, it is no example of what Anglicans desire to achieve in the name of episcopacy

It is spurious. It cannot claim Apostolic Succession if it would. But the Methodist Episcopal Church of America makes no such claim. It has repeatedly and emphatically disavowed the Anglican position as the Anglican, no doubt, would disavow the American Methodist. The power vested in Methodist bishops must not be confused with that other kind of power which Anglican bishops claim to possess of transferring by ordination a certain spiritual fitness for the preaching of Christ's Word and the administration of the Sacraments. It is only power of administration in government. The Episcopacy in American Methodism is only a function; it is not, as with the Anglicans, an order. For this reason the Anglicans would require the re-ordination of Methodist Episcopal ministers. As a matter of fact the only ministers the validity of whose orders the Anglicans are prepared to admit and whom they are prepared to receive without re-ordination are priests of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches.

It makes it no easier for Methodists to accept re-ordination when they are assured that they are not asked to admit the High Church theory of the Episcopacy. For why should they be asked to act in a way that would seem to suggest that the High Church theory after all is true, and that they regard it as true? What Methodists do not admit in thought they are not likely to seem to admit in act. Again; if, as the bishops have admitted, the non-episcopal ministries are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church, why insist that non-episcopal ministers shall act in a way which would seem to indicate that what has been admitted is after all not true; that those ministries are not valid, and that they require episcopal ordination to make them valid? And where is this over-emphasizing of orders and their validity to lead and end? There is an undesirable possibility in the process. A non-episcopal minister, having been encouraged to doubt the validity of his own ministry, may come to doubt the validity of even the Anglican in view of what Rome professes to offer.

Nor can the fundamental difference of view between the Anglicans and the Methodists in respect of the Sacraments be ignored. Upon the High Church theory episcopacy is vital to the Sacraments. Bishops have the succession; they create lawful priests; these impart valid sacraments; and such sacraments convey salvation. Nothing else does that; or, at best, without such sacraments an awful uncertainty hangs over the soul's eternal future. This is not the Christian message as Methodists present it. According to their conception of salvation it is essentially moral, not magical; it comes by faith in God through Christ, not by sacraments, however valuable these may be in the cultivation of the Christian life. And precisely because episcopacy is an organic part of so unworthy a theory of God's ways in salvation its acceptance by Methodists who stand for the evangelical view of Christianity is highly improbable.

In some respects the recently published Sketch of a United Church for England is an improvement on the Appeal of 1920. The Presbyterian and Congregational systems of Church government and orders

are at last recognized and some attempt is made to work these, along with the Anglican, into one form. Greater freedom for the Church in all spiritual matters is aimed at. But the old connexion between Church and State remains. The proposal involves, not the disestablishment of the Anglican Church but the establishment of the Churches now known as Free. Whether this would be a gain for the religion of the Spirit is gravely doubtful.

And the old difficulty over the episcopacy and episcopal ordination remains. The ministers of the united Church are still to be episcopally ordained though no doctrine of episcopacy is to be made part of the constitution of the Church. So one is left wondering whether after all reunion is brought any the nearer, for let it be affirmed in conclusion that from the Methodist point of view no organization or re-organization of religion is satisfactory which in any way, especially in respect of its ministry, suggests that it has a monopoly in the world of God's redeeming Grace. As well pretend to have a monopoly of God's sun-light and fresh air.

NICHOLAS M. CUTHBERT.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

A Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the Assistance of Roderick McKenzie, and with the Co-operation of Many Scholars. Part 8: *perigraphe—sisilismos*. (Oxford University Press.)

The new Liddell and Scott is now so well-known that it is only necessary to remind readers of this Review that its chief interest for the student of the Greek Testament and of early Christian literature is the full use that is made of evidence from the inscriptions and the papyri. It is no longer assumed that Greek literature ended with Aristotle, or that only the writers of the literary *Koine* deserve attention in a Greek Lexicon. To some of us it is a matter of regret that Patristic literature has been excluded on the ground that Dr. Darwell Stone is editing a Lexicon of Patristic Greek, for, as we shall show presently, there are some words whose rarer meaning is found more fully developed in these writings. The exclusion of Byzantine Greek is a less serious matter, apart altogether from the promised Modern Greek Lexicon, because one can refer to the more or less unsatisfactory Lexicon by Sophocles. It may be of interest if we give a few examples of words which occur in the New Testament where insufficient information is given in the new L. & S. The interesting word *peripsema* is found once in the N.T. (1 Cor. iv. 13) where Paul ironically describes himself and his fellow-apostles as the 'offscouring of all things.' It is a term of bitter contempt. This is the only reference given in the new L. & S., but there are three references to inscriptions for the meaning 'your humble servant.' It is strange that the editors have overlooked Tobit v. 19, which is rendered in the R.V. 'Be not greedy to add money to money; but let it be as refuse in respect of our child.' Canon D. C. Simpson, in the Oxford Apocrypha, offers the rendering, 'Let not money be added to money; but let it be a ransom for our child.' In the Apostolic Fathers the word is found four times with quite a different meaning from that in 1 Cor. Lightfoot's translation is as follows. Ignatius, *Ephes.* viii., 'I devote myself for you.' Here the original thought, 'I am as the meanest among you' has developed into 'I devote my life for you.' Ignatius, *Ephes.* xviii., 'My Spirit is made an offscouring for the cross.' Here the idea of self-abasement merges in that of self-sacrifice. 'My spirit bows itself at the foot of the cross' becomes

'My spirit devotes itself for the sake of the cross.' Barnabas iv. 9, 'I was anxious to write to you being your devoted slave.' Barnabas vi. 5, 'I, who am the offscouring of your love,' which means 'I am devoted to your love.' It seems a pity that no suggestion is given in the lexicon of this development in the use of a rare word.

The meaning of *praetorion* is given under three heads, (1) official residence of a governor, Matt. xxvii. 27, (2) praetorian guard, (3) imperial household, Phil. i. 13. This seems to identify Phil. iv. 22 with i. 13, equating 'praetorium' with 'those of Cæsar's household,' and reminds us of Deissmann's proof that the body of imperial slaves was scattered all over the world, and that there is evidence of imperial slaves even at Ephesus. *Pera*, the word used by all the Synoptists in the commission to the Twelve, is explained as a leathern pouch for victuals, or a wallet. Deissmann's suggestion, based upon inscriptional evidence, might have been added, that it here refers to the beggar's collecting bag. The preposition *pros* is dealt with very fully. Under the heading 'with the Accusative' the meaning 'with,' so common in the N.T. is mentioned with only one N.T. example, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, and this is put down as 'with verbs implying previous motion.' But this takes no account of Mark vi. 2, ix. 19, xiv. 49, and probably John i. 1 and 1 John i. 2, which may be partly due to Aramaic influence. We also miss any reference to the meaning 'to the house of,' which may be illustrated by Matt. xxvi. 37, Acts xi. 3, xvi. 24, John xviii. 24 and possibly xx. 2.

Under *pugme* the well known *crux* in Mark vii. 3, is given as meaning 'diligently.' C. H. Turner's evidence has shown that the word probably means 'up to the elbow.' Under *prosecho* Rom. iii. 5 is taken as in the R.V. text without any hint of the divergent interpretations given by many scholars. The 'seemingly intransitive use' of *prosago*, 'draw near,' might be illustrated from one reading in Acts xxvii. 27. The rare word *proskarteresis* is only attested by Eph. vi. 18 and Philodemus, the first century philosopher. Dr. Milligan has found two papyrus examples of the word. On the other hand, the new L. & S. adds a new papyrus reference under *proskopto* in support of 1 Peter ii. 8. Deissmann, Milligan and Moulton between them had left few words in Grimm's once formidable list of words, 'Biblical and Ecclesiastical.' But they left *prospeinos* there. The new L. & S. has robbed this word of its distinction of being a *hapax legomenon* in Acts x. 10.

Paul uses an interesting word *saino*, originally of a dog wagging its tail, in 1 Thess. iii. 3. This lexicon gives the meaning 'disturb.' But Milligan has shown that this unnecessarily departs from the root meaning of 'fawn upon,' 'beguile.' 'What the Apostle evidently dreaded was that they would allow themselves to be "drawn aside," "allured," from the right path in the midst of the affliction which was then falling upon them.'

The student of the Greek Testament will find it a fruitful pastime to go through each part of this great lexicon of the Greek language comparing the words in Souter's *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New*

Testament with the articles upon them in the new Liddell and Scott. Those whose interest is restricted to writers of the classical period of the language may deplore the large space devoted to the later stage of the Hellenistic period. But all who read such authors as Plutarch, Philo, Josephus, to mention but a few great writers, will be intensely grateful both to the Editors and to the Clarendon Press for their marvellous achievement. Each part is issued at 10s. 6d. But those who have been wise enough to subscribe for the whole series of ten parts are getting them for a total payment of four guineas.

W. F. HOWARD.

Science and Religion. By N. Bishop Harman. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

This is a book by a medical man. The publishers are a little unkind to him, for they say on the cover '[The book] does not claim to be a new *Religio Medici*, yet it has something of the flavour of that treasured book.' This raises an expectation in the reader that is not realized. Has it ever been realized by any book since old Sir Thomas wrote? If a sub-title had been given to this volume, it might have been 'A Doctor's Thoughts upon Religion,' and it has the same limitations and the same kind of value that a book would have on 'A Parson's Thoughts on Science' or 'An Engineer's Thoughts on Literature.' After an introductory chapter named, 'Signs of the Times,' which draws attention to the modern *rapprochement* between religion and science, there are three chapters entitled, 'God,' 'Man,' and 'The Promises of Religion.' A brief 'Conclusion' follows, with a statement of the author's *Credo*. In the first of the three principal chapters the author gives his reasons for believing in God, relying largely on the revived argument from Design. In the second there is a rather desultory account of current thought about the nature of man. It is perhaps best regarded as a prelude to the next chapter, as though Dr. Harman were to say, 'With this account of human nature, we can still go on to claim that Science gives its support to "The Promises of Religion".' For it is to the last subject that he gives himself with greatest zest. He gathers the 'Promises of Religion' (and here he includes all religions) under five heads—'Answers to Prayer,' 'The Doing of Wonders,' 'Freedom from Ills,' 'Forgiveness of Sins,' 'Life after this Life.' One at once asks why present 'Freedom from Ills' (as distinct from *future* freedom, which comes under the last head) is included, for such religions as Buddhism and Islam give no promise of *present* freedom from ills. The answer gives a clue to the writer's method. He shows how science in general, and medicine in particular, tend to relieve men from certain evils. In other words, the method is largely that of Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. And it has to be added that, while the book gives some good examples of the way in which this method may legitimately be used, it betrays no acquaintance with expositions of its limitations. Two examples may be given. Dr. Harman claims

that the development of medicine is God's answer to men's prayers for physical health. This is part of the truth, but the author seems to mean that it is the *whole* truth. Of course, if it were, the pivotal element in prayer would disappear, for cures by medicine and surgery are not confined to people who pray. It is true that doctors say that a patient's 'faith' helps, but here 'faith' in the doctor seems to be an alternative to faith in God. (An 'old tag' is mis-quoted here, and the chief of the few misprints in the book occurs—*labore* for *laborare*.)

Another illustration may be taken from the discussion of Forgiveness. Here Dr. Harman, in defiance of such people as Skeat and the editors of the Oxford Dictionaries, states that 'To forgive is to give back that which was before.' He then illustrates at length from the healing of a wound, and claims that in such phenomena 'nature' forgives, adding that here God too forgives, for 'The laws of nature are the laws of God.' Does this cover all that is meant by Forgiveness? It seems to require, for example, that a wound may be forgiven but not a murder. Has it any bearing on the forgiveness of theft or deceit or pride? Once more, it is surely the man who inflicted the wound who needs forgiveness, not the man who is wounded, and the illustration includes nothing pertinent to the former. It goes without saying that with such an account of Forgiveness the book has nothing to say of the Atonement. The wounded man is not healed in order that his assailant may be forgiven. In brief, Dr. Harman is an amateur in theology. Other instances could easily be added. No expert in theology would say to-day that 'A miracle to be a miracle must be *contrary to known laws of Nature.*' Or again, Dr. Harman approves the substance of a saying of Samuel Galton's about miracles, but he gives no hint either that Galton was quoting from Hume or of the well-known reply to Hume. Yet books by amateurs have their own value. It is true that when an amateur writes on health or medicine, doctors tend to call him a 'quack,' but theologians are too charitable and too wise to use so unfair a synonym for 'amateur.' A book by an amateur on theology—even if the amateur is only a popular novelist—may help a preacher or a theologian in at least three ways. It may illustrate the kind of argument that appeals to educated men in general just at present; it may show him what truths he can take for granted with a religiously minded 'modern man'; it may suggest to him the points where such a man's creed needs enlargement. For all three purposes this whole book will serve him well; for the second and third the Creed with which our author ends his book is 'treasure trove.'

C. RYDER SMITH.

A Portrait of Paul. By J. Alexander Findlay, M.A., D.D.
('God and Life' Series—Epworth Press. 3s. 6d. net.)

In his interesting and valuable book, *A Portrait of Paul*, Dr. J. Alexander Findlay has added distinction to the 'God and Life' Series, and has provided the general reader with a useful and profitable

study of the personality and thought of the great Apostle. Dr. Findlay holds that Paul represents only one of three types among Christian believers, but he believes that the Apostle 'does interpret for us the soul which has kept the Church alive.' 'Paul is not the rock on which the Church is built; he is rather the Moses who strikes the rock into life.' In this persuasion Dr. Findlay has given us five studies which in successive chapters discuss: I. Saul of Tarsus before Conversion; II. The Missionary; III. The Thinker; IV. The Pastor and Letter-Writer; V. The Man and the Saint. In these chapters the reader will find the lucid and arresting discussions and the fertile and challenging suggestions which he has already learned to expect in Dr. Findlay's books. It is impossible to chronicle here the many excellent points which are made, and we can do no more than mention, among others, his claim that Paul was a martyr to the cause of Christian Reunion, his contention that the speeches in the Acts would have been more fluent if Luke had freely composed them, and his repeated suggestion that Paul was a thinker because he was compelled to think for his people. Many of the paraphrases of Pauline passages are illuminating, especially the fine rendering of a portion of 1 Cor. xiii, and there are delightful flashes of humour, as, for example, the suggestion, made with reference to Apollos, that 'many Church members still do not in their hearts think a minister a good preacher, if they can always understand what he is talking about.' Dr. Findlay is among those who accept Dr. Duncan's belief that the Epistles of the Imprisonment were written at Ephesus, and he thinks that Paul was an eyewitness of the events of the Passion. More debatable is his belief that Acts xi. 30 and Acts xv are different accounts of the same visit to Jerusalem, and the same must be said of his confident acceptance of the 'Western' reading in Acts xv. 20 and 29 (the Decree). We also find it hard to believe that the standard of Paul's literary style is to be found in Ephesians or Colossians, or to feel convinced that John Mark returned to Jerusalem because he was annoyed to find that Barnabas was being overshadowed, or to accept the 'guess' that Paul deferred his visit to Ephesus because 'John the Elder' was already there. These speculations, and others of the kind, will do no harm unless incautious readers harden them into facts; and, of course, any writer who desires to tell the story of Paul's life and thought finds it necessary to give rein to the historic imagination. The real test of such works is whether they set the personality and work of the Apostle in true historical perspective, and judged by this canon Dr. Findlay's book is a fine and penetrating study. It paints the portrait of one whom he is compelled to admire by the logic of facts, and this is all the more interesting because from the book itself we should judge that his deeper sympathies and affections lie elsewhere. As he sees him, Paul was 'every inch a gentleman,' a man of sturdy independence, possessed of a sharp tongue and of a charming and playful wit. No recluse and no Puritan, he had broad and secular interests and a shrewd knowledge of human nature, and above everything was

intensely alive, 'on fire with a kind of explosive energy which still burns on in these letters in which he lives for ever.' As he grew older he mellowed, and we get nearest to his soul when we think of his three great words 'love,' 'gospel,' 'in Christ.' 'Paul was great as a missionary, great as a theologian and pastor, greatest as a lover of his Lord.' Such is Dr. Findlay's final word, and unquestionably here he lays his finger on the deepest element in Paul's complex personality.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

The Message of the Parables. By R. E. Roberts, D.D.
('God and Life' Series—Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

Jesus taught in pictures, and in realistic pictures. They are such that men do not look at them once or twice only, for that which they see in the pictures is linked up with something deeper, something eternal. Among the most familiar of His pictures are the Parables, and, simple though they appear, because of that 'something' more than is in them, interpreters of all ages have found in them a treasure out of which to draw things both new and old. To New Testament scholars some of them offer problems as difficult and as fascinating as any which they attempt to solve, but Dr. Roberts in *The Message of the Parables* is not concerned with the more critical but with the more practical exposition. The fifteen chapters of this book are popular—in the best sense of that word—interpretations which attract both by their insight and their freshness. The titles of some of the chapters such as 'A1 and C3,' 'R.S.V.P.,' 'CARRY ON,' set the reader guessing as to what parables are to be so described: his interest thus aroused is never allowed to flag in the exposition. These 'truths embodied in a tale' were originally drawn from familiar scenes of everyday life, and Dr. Roberts writes about them in a colloquial style easy to read making them illustrate the needs, the fears, the sins, the hopes, the defeats, the victories of men and women amid the complex problems of our time. To this end he uses his wide reading, especially in current literature, and does not disdain apposite quotations even from sources which are more modern than literary. Teachers and preachers will find here much to stimulate their own thought, and may learn not a little how to make vivid and arresting to their hearers the eternal truth in the thought forms of to-day.

F. B. CLOGG.

This Changing World. By Major-General H. N. Sargent.
(Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.)

In so far as the author confines himself to his central thesis, which is that the need of the age is the Christian Religion and that Britain has a great task and responsibility by reason of her eminent position among the peoples of the world, he will have the sympathy of Christian thinkers in every shade of opinion. This changing world brings its challenge to all. But not all will agree with his tactics which would

be more appropriately found under the title, 'The Unchanging Mind.' The book is an attempt to prove that where everything else moves on theology stands still. The author fights a rear-guard action with skill and courage; but it is a rear-guard action. The position he seeks to maintain is that the Bible is verbally inspired, that its science is substantiated by all 'real' scientists, that the Old Testament is on the same level of morality and religion as the New (at times one is tempted to think that it is on a higher level), that it abounds in prophecies which are the forecasting of particular events and which have all, save the few that remain to be fulfilled in our day, been justified by the event; and that securely embedded in it all is the calling and destiny of the British Empire to the leadership and the dominance of the world. The blame for the decay of religion he fastens upon the Modernist and the Critic, while he finds much comfort in the British Israel teaching. 'It removes all doubt concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures, and has brought many to Christ, giving them comfort, assurance and joy which they never knew before.' Those who agree with this kind of thing will find it all set forth with an abundance of argument and a variety of quotation which it would surprise no one more than the author to find in this connexion. The people who prefer to bring a flexible mind to *This Changing World* will find that the author has plenty of time to turn aside from his defence of the *status quo* to aim an occasional missile at them but they will not mind, because he generally misses the mark. Whatever may be the Major-General's attitude to progress and development in military affairs, in theological matters he puts his faith in the obsolete.

R. E. ROBERTS.

The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt. By George A. Buttrick. (Charles Scribner's Sons. 8s. 6d.)

This volume gains in interest for us because the author's father was a Primitive Methodist minister. The interest becomes intensified by the sheer merit of the book. It is a bold, scholarly analysis of the 'modern deluge of misgiving,' while the positive values of the Christian Faith are re-stated. The author went to America as a young man, and that he deserves the high regard in which he is there held can be understood from the quality of his book. It is claimed that we live in an age of doubt, 'belief seems the exception and unbelief the rule . . . scepticism is almost dogmatic.' Dr. Buttrick is sympathetic to honest doubt and candour of mind. Sometimes doubt is a matter of temperament rather than in the puzzlement of the mind, and the Church has been wrong to excommunicate such doubters. Christ made one such an apostle. There is cause enough for doubt in our kind of world, not only because of the barriers which the mind discovers in its quest, but also those strange and tragic contradictions we meet in our experience: disasters, epidemics, graft and war all making us question the 'scheme of things.' To the sceptic

there is an intelligent answer. Dr. Buttrick skilfully analyses doubt in the modern mind because of the New Science, the New Psychology, the Money Motive and Humanism. To all of which he has a reply. Then his thesis becomes that the taproot of much modern scepticism is in our practice. 'If we live falsely, there is scant likelihood that the mind will be unclouded or belief radiant. . . . Blood on our hands turns black—within the mind!' Then follows a restatement of the fundamentals of the Christian Faith, several of the chapters being originally given as the Merrick Lectures at Ohio Wesleyan University. There is a sane and at times brilliant discussion of such issues as the finality of Jesus, the authority of the Bible, the validity of prayer, the cross, and immortality.

W. R. CHAPMAN.

The Way to God. (Student Christian Movement. 3s 6d.)

It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of a book like this because its matter and form are so timely and speak to the condition of to-day. A modern writer has said that thought is not life, but a mode of life. Religion like life is more than thought but quality and stability can only be secured when serious thought is given to the fundamental principles of the faith, which demands sustained interest. The authors of these talks are splendidly fitted for their tasks. They combine in themselves the rich fruits of modern scholarship and the religious experience of disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ so that their mellow wisdom is born of faith and reason. The Archbishop of York in a foreword expresses the hope that serious attention will be given to the talks and the subjects pursued in study circles, which would certainly enhance their value. The Religious Director of the B.B.C. sets out the purpose of the book in the introduction. It is to state the Christian position against the background of what is called the New Morality and Modern Thought, the former is left for a later treatment but he treats of Modern Thought in the present book. The lectures that follow deal with 'the historic conception of God and man because in these conceptions lie the main differences between Christianity and other religions, with which it is, and always must be, in conflict.' They start with man because man learns about himself before he learns about God. Principal J. S. Whale addresses himself to the question, 'What is man?' and deals with human nature and its need of God. In a lucid and informing way we see the unique endowments of man that are only fully realized in a spiritual relation with God. Dr. W. R. Matthews, who is a well known writer on the philosophy of the Christian religion, treats of the subject, 'Does God speak?' and with the touch of an expert helps all, who will be helped, to tune in to the Message of God in Nature, the Message of God in the human soul, and the Message of God in the Prophets. Not the least instructive part of the book are the answers that these scholars give to representative questions sent in by those who first heard the talks. It would seem as if there is a growing interest in a rational presentation of the Christian religion in terms of modern

thinking and that the far flung influence of the B.B.C. is being used for that purpose ought to occasion much gratitude and these publications are to be encouraged.

DAVID COOKE.

From Christianity to Spiritualism. By C. T. Campion, M.A.
(Allen & Unwin Ltd. 4s. 6d.)

This book attempts to show that Spiritualism is the goal of religious development, a development, however, dependent on a new and different conception of Christianity and the spiritual life. The author contends that St. Paul queered the pitch of true religious development; that the Creeds unwisely and erroneously declared the mission of Jesus Christ to be redemptive—a belief totally unacceptable to the spiritualist; that orthodox Christianity is on wrong lines and, as a belief, is in no way more important than either Buddhism or Confucianism; and that Roman Catholics, Protestants and other types of believers have no priority over each other in approximation to truth, all being equally right as far as they go. Indeed, argues the author, the test of a religion—of Christianity as of any other—is not one of belief in creeds but of its insistence on morality and brotherly love. No one, therefore, needs first to become a Christian before he can become a Spiritualist. Spiritualism is not Christianity and does not claim to be Christian. Jews, Buddhists or Mahomedans can become Spiritualists. In this way, by stressing morality and brotherly love rather than creeds and doctrine, Spiritualism supersedes Christianity, is the true development of the religion of the prophet, Jesus, and, by its alleged discoveries in the spiritual world, is the goal of the religious life.

The case is plausible but somewhat unconvincing. Even the assertion that Spiritualism has been proved true is in itself a matter of speculation. There are certain 'proofs' which are not adequate. Moreover, certain specimen 'conversations' presented by the author appear to be too slickly in accord with what might be expected and believed by the receiver of the message. And if not that, the 'messages' suggest that the other-world speakers have been cleverly trained in the art of propaganda. This, of course, does not dismiss the matter. It does suggest, however, that advocates of Spiritualism have yet a long way to go in providing better and happier evidence before they can expect any measure of acceptance by the Church. Meanwhile, neither the Church nor Christianity must be regarded as either insufficient or false because it considers such a time has not arrived. That psychical research has yet to reveal many astounding discoveries in the realm of the spirit, few will deny. But that all this will mean the abandoning of many of the foundations of the Christian faith, and a realization that for two thousand years Christians have been mistaken in their belief is a presumption which neither the present claims of Spiritualism nor the considered judgement of Christian thinkers can justify.

T. W. BEVAN.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

The Life and Writings of Giambattista Vico. By H. P. Adams.
(Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d. net.)

Vico is numbered among the great philosophers and is sure of a place among the biographies of the wise, but he has never received much attention in England. This may be partly due to the obscurity of his chief works. There is an anecdote about his *Scienza Nuova* similar to those told about Browning's *Sordello*. Nicola Capasso said that no sooner had he begun to read it than he felt he must have lost every spark of intelligence. So Douglas Jerrold felt when *Sordello* was given to cheer him on a bed of sickness. Moreover when Vico's writings appeared in the early part of the eighteenth century, the English devotees of the philosophy of Locke would be disinclined to listen to an Italian who leaned to Platonism. Vico was born in poverty in Naples in 1668 and spent practically the whole of his life there. He held the poorly paid chair of rhetoric there until 1741 when his son Gennaro succeeded him. He himself survived for three more years and thus entered upon his seventy-seventh year in spite of life-long weakness of constitution. It was a hundred years after the publication of his greatest work that he achieved European fame through the exposition of Michelet, the French historian. The nineteenth century, however, found much of his philosophy very much after its own heart and to-day Italy recognizes him as one of its greatest teachers.

Mr. H. P. Adams has now given to us the best interpretation of the career and significance of Vico that we have in English. It is a striking study of a life dedicated to truth. Fortunately for Vico the age of reason had checked much of the dark intolerance of the Church in Italy and he was allowed to develop his critical studies in peace. He died a loyal member of the Roman Church but narrow-minded clergy looked upon him with suspicion. In days when the sciences of psychology, epistemology and sociology were not separated he penetrated some of their deepest secrets by his original genius. It was a wide field that he traversed. Beginning with the study of law and poetry he was led back to the origins of language and of human society. The classics of Greece and of Rome and then of his own Italy led to penetrating judgements on history and it is in this field perhaps that his most enduring work was achieved. His originality in finding many authors in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* will be forgotten and his conceptions of the origin of religion will not be acceptable in the future but his greatness as the first thinker to set forth a valid philosophy of history will endure.

'He was the founder of the philosophy of history. Voltaire has the credit for being the first writer to speak of a philosophy of history. But Vico only missed it by an accident of phrasing. "There has

hitherto been lacking," he wrote, "a science which should be at the same time a history and a philosophy of humanity". The survey of the quiet career of this lonely thinker is a tribute to human nature. An Arminian may be pardoned if he rejoices to learn that one of the few European theologians and scholars to recognize the greatness of Vico while he was still alive was Le Clerc, a true disciple of Arminius and one of the clearest and most courageous champions of freedom that the eighteenth century produced.

A. W. HARRISON.

Interpreters of Life. By Robert Strong, M.A., B.Litt.
(‘God and Life’ Series—Epworth Press. 3s. 6d. net.)

Those who know Mr. Strong will expect to find in this book evidence of a wide range of reading, clear thought matched by equally clear expression, an aptness of quotation, a penetrative and sympathetic literary criticism, a sanity of judgement, an impatience of what is sham and superficial, a knack of summing up and evaluating persons, situations and writings in a phrase that is at once just and discriminating. Such expectations will not be disappointed. The book if read will probably be re-read, and cannot fail to be rewarding. The essays are very short, but each is suggestive far beyond its length. The quality of the author's spirit as well as of his mind is revealed on every page, and the severe compression of the style helps the essential truth to stand out more clearly. It is as though the writer is for ever turning from the circumference to the centre, from the ephemeral to the abiding, from mystery to meaning. Each essay seems to say one central thing, and there is a fugue-like quality about the book, the same ideas recurring in new settings with deepening impressions to become the dominating thesis of the book itself. Few could read this book without gaining in knowledge, or what is of infinitely greater moment gaining in wisdom for life. The book may be taken as an insistent exposition of the truth, that where there is no vision people perish. The author is thoroughly at home in the wide field of literature. His chapters on Ibsen, T. E. Brown, Robert Bridges and others may send the reader with new zest to study these writers. The psychology of religion is everywhere peeping out (cf. the essays on Donne, Blake, George Herbert, Josephine Butler, &c.). The reader may find himself mirrored in his strength and weakness, and unless he is particularly hardened may find himself shaken by some of the essays (e.g. ‘Self-criticism,’ ‘Mr. Worldly Wiseman’) out of complacency and self-phantasy. The book will make its readers think. It will do more, it will make them see, and see with such insight that they will have deeper assurance as they take life's common road, and a higher and more enduring courage to live each day's life with a sense of destiny as in the very presence of God.

J. T. BREWIS.

Methodism and Politics 1791—1851. By E. R. Taylor, B.A.
(Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.)

The Thirlwall and Gladstone Prize Essay for 1933, regards the history of Methodism's relation to politics as the story of a Liberal displacement of a strong Tory sentiment. Wesley adopted a 'No Politics Rule' and strove to keep his movement aloof from party politics but there were men unwilling to be robbed of their political 'birth-right,' and after Wesley's death they gave a political significance to the new sect. Wesley's position as 'The Father of Methodism' is admirably brought out. 'Methodism was the work of one man, and that one man a man of almost unparalleled organizing power mingled with vision, energy, force of personality and a not unreasonable faith that he was an instrument in the hands of God.' His energies were all bent 'to spread Scriptural Holiness throughout the land.' His death removed 'the man who acted as the pivot of Methodist organization.' The French Revolution proved infectious and Methodism could not escape. Kilham hoped that Methodism would become free to develop into a great Dissenting Church but Jabez Bunting stood in the way. Both he and Wesley, Mr. Taylor says, 'were autocrats, but, whilst Wesley's authority held his Societies together, Bunting's produced a loss of 100,000 members in five years (1850–5).' That verdict is not just to Dr. Bunting. The centralization of government and the supremacy of the joint pastorate of Conference 'which marked Wesleyan Methodism by the middle of the nineteenth century, were directly due to his leadership,' but on the other hand stood 'a new class, quickened and inspired by Methodism, rising in the social and economic scale, and becoming an active political force.' The clash between them led to the grievous losses of the half century. The weapons of personal abuse which embittered the struggle had much responsibility for its disastrous results. The violence of the *Fly Sheets* led to a lamentable controversy. Mr. Taylor deals with the whole subject in a way that makes a present-day Methodist thankful for the broader views and more tolerant spirit of our times. His study and that of Dr. Maldwyn Edwards, to which he makes appreciative reference, deserve careful attention and have many lessons for our times.

J. TELFORD.

Joseph Wolff, His Romantic Life and Travels. By H. P. Palmer. (Heath Cranton. 7s. 6d.)

This book illustrates the saying that fact may be stranger than fiction. If the incidents were not backed by documentary evidence it would seem a most incredible story. Joseph Wolff must have been one of the most remarkable men who ever wore the livery of a cleric. He was a cosmopolitan, meeting and mingling with all kinds of people, from the humblest friar to the pope, from hired soldiers to the princes of the earth, from wayside travellers to Goethe and Madame de Staél and he seemed to be equally at home with them all. His mental

pilgrimage was as remarkable, for the book is the story of a man who was born into the Jewish faith and left it to enter the Roman Catholic Church, but who found no satisfaction there and left the papist faith to become an Anglican clergyman. It is perhaps safe to say that he found a spiritual home in none of the ecclesiastical folds, and in turn was in them but was never of them. He was born of Jewish parents and his father was a Rabbi in Franconia, but while Joseph was quite a youth he differed with his father about the criticism of the Christian religion and began to regard Jesus as the promised Messiah. Without money he left home to become a citizen of the world and it would be difficult to imagine anybody travelling farther without purse or script. Wolff had a stormy passage for he was passionate and controversial, and, while he accumulated vast stores of knowledge, he never seemed to reduce his knowledge to any ordered system of theological beliefs. But he was sincere and spoke strongly because he felt deeply. He regarded himself as a missionary to the dispersed Jews and in this capacity travelled in Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, Abyssinia, Afghanistan, India and many other places. He met all kinds of religionists and several interesting side-lights are thrown on the different cults. Few men have touched life at so many points, and though of unusual psychology, he did much fruitful work. 'He took tea on the tops of their houses with the people of Aleppo, smoked with the merchants of Damascus, and seemed as much at home at Tadmor in the desert as at Ille Brewer in Somerset.' The remarkable courage and disinterestedness of Wolff is brought out in the story of his own appointed task of trying to save two British officers who, it turned out, had been done to death by the Ameer of Bokhara. He was too late to save the lives of Colonel Stoddard and Captain Conolly but he showed a fine heroism and humanity by exposing himself to the dangers and abuses of the wild tribesmen in his gallant effort. Mr. Palmer is to be congratulated on producing such a remarkable record which will greatly interest all who read it.

DAVID COOKE.

Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life, 1660-1800.

By E. D. Bebb, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press. 7s. 6d. net.)

Dr. Bebb's book, which has for its sub-title: 'Some problems of the present as they appeared in the past,' is one of those valuable and all too rare studies of the creative sources of social development. Every social problem with which we are now faced is a complicated thing, simply because society is so intricately complex an organism; while the complexity of the present situation has itself been conditioned by the involved operative forces of its history. Unfortunately, one of those forces has been emphasized to the neglect of others, and 'history' has come to be regarded as 'the study of past politics,' with kings and statesmen as its great figures and wars and treaties as its main interests. It is, of course, undeniable that governmental action is a powerful social factor; but it must be insisted that other factors ought not to

be overlooked, or else history will be a partial and inadequate guide to us who are faced with the urgent problems of our present day. No merely political history, for instance, can reveal to us the full significance for the welfare of mankind of the eighteenth century; the century which prepared the way for the Industrial Revolution and shaped its form. Nor, for that matter, can a history which confines itself to the economic nexus of society. We need to know something of the attitudes and actions of representative individuals or influential groups. Dr. Bebb's book is to be welcomed because, having this end in view, it is supremely concerned with facts, and no generalization escapes untested by fact. The political, economic, and religious background is competently outlined. Then the numerical strength of Nonconformity is mapped as accurately as the meagre information at our disposal permits. Following this an account is given of the wealth and social standing of the Nonconformists; and it may be added that these chapters are vastly more interesting than a statement of their subjects might indicate. So we know what weight Nonconformity might have in social and economic affairs. The rest of the study shows us how that weight was used, and we who read the story should feel proud of our ancestry and heartened to face our own difficult problems. We know of Wesley and Fox and Howard, and Dr. Bebb introduces us to others—Lawson, Haines, Firmin, Bellers, Dagge—whom we should do well to honour. Behind them were the many whose sense of personal responsibility before God made them both diligent in business and active in reform. The conclusion that Nonconformity exercised a beneficial influence proportionately greater than its numerical strength is convincingly demonstrated. If we have any quarrel with Dr. Bebb, it is that his scholarly caution leads him to under-estimate that influence, which is itself good evidence of the scrupulous fairness of his presentation. This is a book woven of the real stuff of social history.

E. ROGERS.

Liberal Puritanism. By A. W. HARRISON, M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D. ('God and Life' Series—Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

The Epworth Press has recently conferred a real benefit upon students and the general reader alike by the publication of two important series of books entitled 'Great Religions of the East' and 'God and Life.' In the latter series, Dr. Harrison's volume holds a high place and we hope that it will be widely read. It comprises a number of essays dealing with the general theme of Liberal Puritanism. As the author so justly observes, Puritanism is not a seventeenth-century English phenomenon but a recurring phase in Christian history and an inevitable accompaniment of every period of religious revival. This contention is abundantly illustrated by a most suggestive treatment of Montanism, the cult of St. Francis and the Lollards in the time of Richard II (an essay contributed by Mrs. Harrison). We are glad to find that Dr. Harrison is alive to the strength and

weakness of Puritanism. It would appear to be still necessary to refute the famous indictment of Macaulay that 'the Puritan hated bear-baiting not because it gave pain to the bear but because it gave pleasure to the spectators.' The attitude of the Puritans towards popular amusements has so often been misunderstood because their critics will not take the trouble to ascertain the historical facts or try and discover the precious things for which Puritans of all ages have stood. Historically, as Dr. Harrison says, 'Puritanism was a plea for the simplicity of the primitive Church, for purity in morals and for righteousness in the national life as well as that of the individual.' The weakness of Puritanism is found in its failure to appreciate the significance of some of the implications of the Incarnation and to realize that the experience of God is none the less real when it is mediated by material forms.

The rejection of the Puritan attitude towards life is illustrated in the essay on D. H. Lawrence, which contains an admirable summary of the writings of that strange personality who, for some reason that is not clear, exercises such a potent influence over a number of modern intellectuals. Lawrence revolted against his Puritan environment with such violence that he became incapable of discerning the value of the restraints of conscience or intellect. One cannot help but feel that the veneration in which he is held in certain circles is tinged with that insincerity which Lawrence himself so much deplored.

In the opening and closing words of this book, Dr. Harrison remarks that 'Puritanism has come in these days (I know not how) to be considered as much a subject for contempt as it was in the days of the Restoration.' Lies die hard, but misrepresentations can hardly prevail against the combination of historical knowledge and religious insight displayed in these essays.

HAROLD ROBERTS.

* * * * *

Those who know Thornton Wilder's books would scarcely expect the new character in his latest novel. In *Heaven's My Destination* (Longmans, 7s. 6d. net) we have a mentally and spiritually short-sighted hero creating by his own lovable stupid presence a series of high pressure areas in the little American towns he visits. The book is highly entertaining. George Brush, the chief character, is a travelling salesman and a fundamentalist with a complete equipment of immature ideas on every social problem. Possibly he is slightly over-drawn, at least he is not a familiar specimen, and yet if his eccentricities are exaggerated they have been portrayed so cleverly that the reader longs to enlighten him and is pleasantly annoyed by his folly. The ever-changing background to the story is a good picture of American small town life.

GENERAL

New Pathways in Science. By Sir Arthur Eddington.
(Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.)

It is six years since Sir Arthur issued *The Nature of the Physical World* and in these Messenger Lectures delivered at Cornell University in 1934 he has brought together the fruits of further studies of modern science and the philosophical outlook to which it leads. The lectures are based on a number of topics which he has dealt with in lectures and addresses since 1929 when *Science and the Unseen World* appeared. The opening lecture shows how the Scientific picture of the world is related to the 'familiar story' in our minds. The perceiving part of the mind tells of a world around us and leads us to realize that we must not put overmuch confidence in the story-teller who lives in our mind, though he must not be ignored altogether. The only channel of communication between them is the nervous system in our bodies. As to the existence of an external world Sir Arthur's answer, derived from his own existence, must be in the affirmative, nor does he think that the 'external world of physics is the *only* world that really exists.' 'Dramatis Personæ' introduces the reader to the building of an atom out of an equal number of protons and electrons, and to the ether which fills the universe beyond the remotest stars. The quantum theory in which electrons and protons are replaced by waves is clearly described and we are prepared by this introduction to the dramatis personæ to follow Sir Arthur in his fascinating studies. As to 'The end of the World' he is not inclined to prophesy, but one of several possibilities is that the ball of radio waves may double its diameter about every 1,500 million years and go on expanding in geometrical progression for ever—that would present the end of the physical world as one stupendous broadcast. The release from determinism brought about by the present indeterministic theory of the physical universe leads to 'something which a reasonable man might *almost* believe.' After lectures on 'Indeterminacy and the Quantum Theory,' and 'Probability,' we come to 'The Constitution of the Stars.' 'There can be little doubt that the heat of the sun and of other stars is being maintained by the liberation of some form of subatomic energy in the interior.' Those vast supplies of energy surpass the wildest dreams of the engineer, and the lecturer has a dream that some day our engines may be fed not with coal and oil but do their work on a plain diet of subatomic energy. Sir Arthur is also convinced that the idea of the expanding universe is 'not just an interesting side-track, but is on the main route of the future development of physics. It will have a practical importance in astronomy also; for if the value of the nebular recession calculated from the ordinary laboratory constants agrees with that found by astronomical observation, it will check the accepted scale of distances of the nebulae, which is at present somewhat doubtful.' The subject

of the expanding universe is one that it is of the utmost importance to continue investigating. In his Epilogue Sir Arthur expresses his view that 'although for the most part our inquiry into the problem of experience ends in a veil of symbols, there is an immediate knowledge in the minds of conscious beings which lifts the veil in places; and what we discern through these openings is of mental and spiritual nature. Elsewhere we see no more than the veil.' He thinks that Sir James Jeans has rejected the right explanation in his view of the Great Architect of the Universe as a pure mathematician. The lectures are an introduction to a world of wonders which grow more amazing as we sit at the feet of such a master as Sir Arthur Eddington.

J. TELFORD.

The Church Architecture of Protestantism. By A. L. Drummond, B.D., Ph.D. (Edin.). (T. & T. Clark. 15s.)

Many books have been written on the development of church architecture with a purely architectural outlook. In Dr. A. L. Drummond's book, *The Church Architecture of Protestantism*, he deals with the subject from a new standpoint, showing a close relationship between it and a sound understanding of the religious and architectural influences which affect the development of all ecclesiastical architecture. This work covers an extensive field of research, including work from many European countries, as well as a large number of American examples; with numerous and admirable illustrations from all countries. A masterly survey of the early historical styles, including the Gothic and Greek revival periods, so often held in contempt, but nevertheless producing many extremely interesting churches, leads to an outline of the Renaissance of church building; and culminates with progressive development of present day work. The influences of function, psychology, and mode of worship, on the design and planning of churches are clearly stated, and where controversial are discussed with sympathetic appreciation of the differing views. Of particular interest is the chapter on 'Traditionalism or Modernism.' While considering the tendency of the one school 'to canonise the past,' appreciation is shown of the other school endeavouring to attain a new solution to the problem, with the use of new materials and the consequent creation of new forms; as evidenced in the work of some of the continental architects, though at present still in the experimental stage. The careful consideration of the needs of the Catholic and Protestant creeds and the consequent effect on the arrangement of their churches, and the possibility of a compromise in the architectural setting and furnishings is significant, as also is the necessity for careful consideration of the acoustic properties of the building. The description of the 'Church for Clydeside' is intriguing, but it is questionable if it would be readily acceptable to the emotions of the British people, who are still conservative in their view of new developments or ideas, and slow in their inception. The chapter on practical suggestions for improvements is of great interest, and

shows the need for the sympathetic collaboration of the architect, craftsman, and religious authorities. If this is achieved a definite advancement in the design of our churches will be apparent; and buildings worthy of the purpose for which they are intended, will stand as a symbol of Protestantism. The author is to be warmly congratulated on such an inspired and interesting study of Protestant church architecture, full of vitality, with sympathetic understanding of the work of the past, and so optimistic an outlook for the future.

F. W. H. ALLISON.

Why We Feel the Way. By Augustus W. Tretten, Ph.D.
(Boston: The Stratford Coy. \$3.)

Dr. Tretten divides this analysis of human nature into four parts: Fundamental Factors underlying the Emotions of Man; Types of Emotional Reaction; Pathology of the Emotions; Training of the Emotional Reactions. A human being is alive and is surrounded by a real everyday-workable world which has peopled the world of the imagination with fantastic, even grotesque monsters to be feared, cherished or destroyed. This has produced a rich fruitage of emotions with which man is still struggling. The emotional reactions are then considered; theories of the emotions and the emotional reactions are discussed. Man is still in the process of making. His body has not yet completed its successful adjustment, and his intellectual and effective evolution is 'still in the ox-cart stage of his cognitive development.' The various types of emotional reaction, such as hunger and thirst, fear and anger, love and hate, industry and war are considered with much suggestive detail. The accumulation of great wealth in the hands of a few is one of the gravest dangers of a general social conflict which has ever confronted the United States, since it destroys the very integrity of her great middle class of citizens. In the section on the Psychology of the Emotions, crime and insanities receive special attention. The professional criminal follows that career in order to make a living, others fail to adjust themselves to the behaviour of the social group. The individual must learn from early childhood to play the game of life fairly, to give and take, to share privileges and responsibilities, to respect the rights and properties of others. The Training of the Emotional Reactions lays stress on habits. If the native tendencies are utilized as the root-stalks of personality, for personal habits to be engrafted upon they become the foundations of human character. The chapter on Sex Emotions and Sex Control is of special value and the final study of Recreation *vs.* Wreck-Creation is a warning against that violation of the laws of Nature which ends in disaster. The book is clear in statement, reasonable and practical throughout. Young people will gain much by a careful study of it.

OBITER DICTA

If Dr. Alfred E. Garvie's *Revelation Through History and Experience* (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 5s. net), be intended as his final contribution to theological thought, many will wish to signalize the occasion by a tribute to a brilliant scholar and thinker whose spiritual guidance they have learned to value. Ministers and laymen alike have hailed the publication of Dr. Garvie's books with unusual interest. He has never at any time shown himself a glib writer. His writings are informed by deep thought and unimpeachable sincerity and bear evidence of a soul ever on the quest. Indeed, in none of his books has he ever allowed prejudice or partiality to vitiate sincerity and candour. Not a few still cherish the memory of their first reading of *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus* as a rich experience. Into that book Dr. Garvie admits having put what was best in his living and thinking for nearly twenty years. It is one of the books to which some of his readers still return. In his introduction to *Revelation Through History and Experience* he describes his emancipation from Calvinistic dogmatism and traces his theological development to his acceptance and realization of 'the love of God through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ in the communion of the Holy Spirit' as the sum and substance of his theology. He also breaks through his native reserve and pays a beautiful tribute to his aunt and his wife, two saintly women who greatly influenced his thought and character. Into this new volume, occasioned by his appointment by the Senate of the University of London to deliver four lectures at King's College, Dr. Garvie concentrates 'the fruits of nearly half a century of study, reflection, and teaching on the Christian doctrine of God as based on the Christian history.' In the first lecture, 'God as Father,' he discusses the Originality, the Authority, and the Sufficiency of Jesus. He says that 'if God be what He must needs be conceived to be, if conceived as God at all, His nature, character and purpose in relation to man must hold the foremost place in man's interest, inquiry, desire.' He feels that the revelation of God in Christ is not dominant as it should be, even in Christian theology, and he confesses that for years he has been revising his own theology under the guiding principle that he will believe nothing inconsistent with the revelation of the Father in the Son and that he 'will believe anything that that revelation leads him to believe as by sound inference resulting from the conception of God's Fatherhood.' It is his conviction that our thought of Christ must be determined by His thought of God. The remaining chapters are entitled, Jesus as Christ and Lord, The Holy Spirit as Life-Giver, and Father, Son, and Holy Spirit One God, An epilogue on Application to Theology of Conception of God concludes what many will cherish as a precious legacy. 'God,' says Dr. Garvie, 'is the environment in which alone human personality can find its fulfilment; resistance to that environment must mean lapse of that

personality.' But if God be Father as well as Creator, may we not dare to believe that He would not have assumed the responsibility of creating, had He not in His Fatherhood the resources of holy love, truth and grace, judgement and forgiveness, which will finally redeem and reconcile the world to Himself. His final word strikes a triumphant note: 'a creed which begins in a benediction will end in a doxology.'

* * * * *

There is often a certain amount of confusion between what constitutes a legend and a myth. A legend presupposes some historical fact or character whereas the myth is applied to everything which has no existence in reality. The legends which have grown round the figure of Christ, at one time regarded as only suitable for the nursery, have been found to contain material of the utmost value. In the study of religious development, in literary and historical research, and the work of religious education a knowledge of these hallowed fancies of the popular mind is becoming more and more essential. In *Medieval Legends of Christ* (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.), Dr. Rappoport has rendered accessible to the interested reader a wonderful collection of these beautiful and astonishing stories—they have been gathered from many literatures and languages, European and Oriental, and enhance the scholarly reputation of the author. Maybe legend is 'the romance of Theology and History and instead of reasoning and collecting facts, the religious mind in legend can dream pleasantly and be instructed as well as entertained.' This volume must be considered as the complete text book on this fascinating subject. For the preacher and the teacher as well as for the Bible student it is invaluable. And apart from that it is of absorbing interest to the ordinary reader. The Introduction is a masterpiece of clear explanation—concise and yet covering the ground adequately, and the book is divided into chapters ranging from (1) The Maid of Galilee to (2) The legends of Joseph, Judas and Pilate. Many of these legends are quite new to us and the comparisons which we are able to make of the ones we have known for so long and these which Dr. Rappoport has brought from the storehouse of ancient and mediæval literature, are as instructive as they are entertaining. The legend of the Wandering Jew is exhaustively dealt with in a few pages and this strikes one as an outstanding feature of this book—the compression which is so well done as to be unnoticed.

* * * * *

The intrinsic beauty of the Gospel according to Luke seldom fails in its appeal. Renan described it as the most beautiful book that has ever been written and the gusto pervading *In the Things of My Father, A Study of the Purpose of Luke the Evangelist* (Hodder & Stoughton, 5s. net), suggests that its author, the Rev. Wilfrid L. Hannam, shares the high estimate of the famous French critic. Mr. Hannam has specialized on the third Gospel. He assumes the evangelist's point

of view, looks through his eyes, visualizes the unfolding ministry of Jesus and acts as guide in a wonderful gallery of art. And he invites his readers to attend solely to what Luke has to say. He has the insight of a true interpreter, can depict a scene, and etch a portrait in well-drawn lines. He is moreover a teacher and presents his case clearly, concisely, almost inevitably. He is artist and craftsman too, and not in vain has he sat at the feet of the evangelist. He suggests that Luke knew full well that the note he had reached at the end of the parable of the Prodigal Son could not possibly be sustained, that he knew the value of effective contrast and thus placed the Unjust Steward side by side with the Prodigal Son. With a lively appreciation Mr. Hannam sees the scene with his mind's eye and sets an effective background which greatly aids the interpretation of incident and character. Zacchaeus is a good example: 'Up in the tree, with the leaves to hide him, the real Zacchaeus showed his face, and all the longing of his heart found expression in his eyes. One glance was enough for Jesus, and He knew that a lost man was looking at Him, and that everything depended on the first words He said.' He knows human nature and can describe its joys and sorrows, its sins and failures, its laughter, scorn, and aspiration, the conventions that hold us helpless in their 'velvet grip' as well as those 'happy unrestrained intimacies that add an infinite zest to life.' Pregnant observations are scattered throughout the book: 'Whatever else "full of the Holy Spirit" may mean, it certainly means the realization of divine Power. . . . It is the dubious privilege too of the follower to vacillate; the leader must go forward without faltering. . . . The hardest person in the world to encounter is not the avowed enemy, but the devoted friend.' A sense of personal certainty informs this book. Mr. Hannam illustrates in a rare degree the dynamic power of positive preaching—the lack of which is one of the chief defects of the modern pulpit. *In the Things of My Father* is an illuminating study. Here is a fine book within modest compass.

* * * * *

The Reformation and Reunion, by Dr. C. Sydney Carter (Church Book Room, 3s. 6d.), is compact with authentic historical data. The author has honoured the dictum set forth in an able foreword by the Bishop of Manchester: 'Any movement towards Unity must take account of the original causes of disunion, and the real differences between the communions concerned.' He deals with the break between Rome and the Church of England at the Reformation. The Reunion problem is thoroughly examined in Chapters which include 'The Reformation Movement in General'; 'The English Church and Lutheranism under Henry VIII'; 'The English Church and the "Reformed" Continental Churches'; 'The Marian Exiles'; 'The English Reformation Settlement under Elizabeth'; 'Worship and Usage'; 'Later Evidences of Fellowship.' His investigation is naturally concerned with those organized Societies of Christians who refuted the temporal and spiritual claims and authority of the See of Rome

and who recognize that the episcopally ordained ministry is still the crux of the Reunion problem. In conclusion he reminds us of Bishop Davenant's words: 'For the sacred Scriptures forbid us thus to enslave ourselves to any human authority, and our sole Lord and Master Christ Jesus forbids us to acknowledge any upon earth for a Lord over our Faith and Conscience, and that Church which enters into a Communion with another upon these terms doth not hereby purchase a Peace, but rather resigns herself up to a most unjust slavery.'

* * * * *

A Rendezvous with Life—a new volume of sermons on everyday problems from the pen of the Rev. T. E. Ruth, minister of the Pitt Street Congregational Church, Sydney (Angus & Robertson, 4s. 6d. net)—should attract many readers. Some of these sermons were preached in the City Temple, and their breadth of outlook, clarity of vision, cogent reasoning and intense conviction made a deep impression. The book throughout records high moments of vision and exposition. A typical illustration of the author's style is seen in 'What Do You Want?'—The Psychology of Desire: 'Everything alive is hungry—that is the law of all living things. Living things reveal their place in the scale of being by the quality and scale of their hungers. That is a fascinating chapter in the story of desire. And it is characteristic of the book of life. It is the way the world is made. It is the way man is made. It is the line of ascent. Ascending life is simply a question of ascending desires.' A fresh and stimulating volume.

* * * * *

Dr. Richard Roberts is known to readers of *The Renaissance of Faith* and *The Jesus of the Poets and Prophets* as an original and independent thinker and his virile qualities characterize his latest book, *That Strange Man Upon His Cross* (Allenson, 3s. 6d. net). He disavows any attempt to present a 'Life' of Jesus; his endeavour is to show that there is an intelligible continuity in the Gospel story and that the Cross was the inevitable issue. To him, the Cross illustrates 'the irresistible splendour of personality' and he sees the divine pre-eminence of Jesus, 'not in what Jesus did but in what He was.' *Ecce Homo, The Teacher, The Man of Action, and The Crucified* comprise the four sections of the book. His thesis is illustrated by Dr. P. T. Forsyth's 'the Cruciality of the Cross,' the cruciality of that Person in that Act not alone for the gospel and its theology, but for the life of the individual and of the world. 'Personality stands between God and man, bound to God by faith, and to man by love . . . and not the thing it does but the thing it *is*, is the most fruitful gift it can offer to God or man.' The author concludes with an appeal to come to terms with this strange Man upon His Cross.

* * * * *

Robert Russell Wicks, Dean of Princeton University, faces practical problems with candour and courage in *The Reason for Living*—an

approach to the persistent questions of life (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 6s. net). This book is the harvest of a large experience covering a period of ten years during which the author sympathetically listened to the questions of thousands of college students, men and women, both in individual conversations and in groups. His aim is 'to furnish, not some complete and logically arranged scheme of thought, but rather the raw material out of which convictions can be formed.' The first part: Where We All Begin, brings together the familiar experiences which have lain at the root of man's most effective beliefs. None can altogether escape the question, 'What is the reason for living?' Its vital significance raises such problems as Why Live, Creation's Working System, The Appeal to Personality, Concern for Individuals, Unrecognized Faith, God and Personality, and Tradition and Authority. Their importance is brought home in a series of questions which, by their intimate bearing on life, induce serious reflection. Part II is concerned with problems which emerge in the endeavour to live by the faith discussed in the first section of the book: Finding the Right Life, Human Helplessness, Transforming Desire, Adversity, The Art of Keeping Alive, A Commercialized World, and An Interdependent World. A more comprehensive scheme it would be difficult to conceive. At every turn the reader is faced with the fact around which the book is written—that we are ultimately responsible to something beyond human intelligence. This vital book seeks to aid a true interpretation of life and to inspire the reader with a sense of his lofty destiny.

* * * * *

It may be true that in the making of anthologies there is no end, but *The Heavenly Vision* (S.C.M., 5s. net), seems destined to win a secure place and amply justifies the venture of Phyllis Taunton Wood, the compiler. It consists of three books: (1) 'Vision and Aspiration—The Treasure Hid in a Field,' which illustrates the growth from childhood to a conscious faith:

When in the dim beginning of the years,
God mixed in man the raptures and the tears,
And scattered through his brain the starry stuff—

that he might dare the vision and endure. (2) 'Vision and Adoration—A Pearl of Great Price' illustrates the experience of those whose vision has become clear enough for them to enjoy and adore God and which vindicates the claim that in mankind at its highest there is an emergence of the divine, that all our talk about inspiration or prayer involves a belief that in us at such moments there is a real manifestation, a real indwelling of God. The third book illustrates 'Vision and Action—A Grain of Mustard Seed,' which deals with activity inspired by vision. Evelyn Underhill reminds us, for example, that one human spirit can, by its prayer and love, touch and change another human spirit; it can take a soul and lift it into the atmosphere of God. The compiler has ranged over a wide field and gleaned treasures from the Christian classics, poets and mystics of all ages.

The reader may learn with Von Hügel that the inner life of God is something far fuller and richer than is the whole of His creative and providential activity. He may learn, too, that 'the love of human beings must be the shortest road to the vision of God.'

* * * * *

In the fourteen papers of *Drama in School*, A Practical Help to all interested in Dramatic Work (Allman & Son, 3s. 6d. net), by George H. Holroyd, the author has broadly covered the whole field of dramatic activity in schools. A Foreword by the late Sir Nigel Playfair states that he considered this important subject is dealt with very successfully. This is significant in view of Sir Nigel's conviction that 'the value of dramatic experiment in assisting education is overlooked almost everywhere in this country.' Mr. F. E. Harrison, Director of Education, Blackpool, also expresses his appreciation of the author's effort in a discerning Preface. The book is certainly to be commended to all interested in the production of plays in schools, clubs, Young People's Guilds and Women's Institutes. Apart from the valuable suggestions on such problems as articulation and gesture, lighting, make up, costumes, &c., there is a helpful list of plays and books for teachers, and a glossary of technical stage terms. *Drama in School* has an authentic ring.

* * * * *

Four new volumes of the 'God and Life' series have just been issued.—*Methodist Good Companions*, a brilliant first book by G. Elsie Harrison. *What I Believe*, a symposium by eminent ministers and laymen. *The Heavenly Octave*, a study of the Beatitudes by Dr. F. W. Boreham, and *Have Faith in God*, interpretations of the spiritual experiences of sacred writers, chiefly psalmists, by Norman H. Snaith. This excellent series is making a wide appeal. The first four volumes have been well received and promise to exercise a useful ministry not only among ministers, teachers and lay preachers but also among Young People's Societies. In a discerning review *The Times Literary Supplement* notes: 'This attractive new series begins with an interesting group of four volumes which illustrates its wide range. In *A Portrait of Paul*, by Dr. J. Alexander Findlay, we have a really valuable "introduction" to the study of St. Paul's life and work, a book in which a great amount of accurate and careful scholarship is skilfully concealed; so that while the book should be useful to the student (for Dr. Findlay discusses most of the "difficulties" and nearly always his comments, translations or paraphrases are illuminating) yet it is one that the "general reader" could easily enjoy.' *The Message of the Parables* is described as 'a designedly popular exposition of some of the parables, a very good example of its type. Dr. Roberts almost invariably seems able to look at his subject from some fresh or unexpected point of view, and has produced a book that many preachers should find of assistance in their work, not only because of its freshness and vivid illustration, but because of the earnest spiritual conviction which is always apparent.' *Interpreters of Life*, by the Rev.

Robert Strong, is recognized 'as the work of a religious man looking through a wide range of our literature—Bunyan, Donne, Blake, Christina Rossetti, Bridges, T. S. Eliot are some of the names. Not all the studies of course are equal; the style is a shade sentimental, reminiscent of Stevenson with a tendency to use his semi-playful method, but some of the essays, notably that on Donne, show an accurate literary judgement and a wise appreciation of life's problems.' *Liberal Puritanism*, by Dr. A. W. Harrison, is commended as 'a series of able historical essays described by its author as being "merely indications of the high ancestry of Puritanism." Beginning with the Montanists of the second century Dr. Harrison traces his subject through the Franciscans, the Lollards (this capable essay is by his wife), Milton, with an interesting discussion of the poet's views on divorce, Cromwell, the Wesleyan Revival, to R. L. Stevenson, and concludes with an essay on the philosophy of D. H. Lawrence who "reacted against puritanism with all the violence of an overwrought personality." Altogether an interesting and able book.'

* * * * *

Our Heritage of Wild Flowers, by Hilda M. Coley (The Lutterworth Press, 6s. net), will interest both children and adults, though it is written in a simple way particularly suitable for young people. It starts with the life history of a wild flower and the subsequent chapters deal specifically with a large number of the common flowers which are our precious heritage. The book is illustrated with seventeen beautifully drawn colour plates by Louis Johnstone which add very greatly to its educational value. The drawings are on a large scale and every detail of even the smallest plants can be seen quite distinctly. The illustrations are each in themselves pictures in which the artist has cleverly indicated the environment in which the flowers grow. Miss Coley who wrote a most successful book, *Wild Flowers Round the Year*, has added considerably to her prestige by the publication of this new work. Just now when every effort is being made to preserve the amenities of our countryside the book is particularly welcome.

* * * * *

Marguerite Williams, the author of *The Garden of Healing*, has written another charming book: *The Hands of a Man* (Blackie & Son, 7s. 6d. net). It is the story of a medical student who suddenly loses his sight just before taking his final examination. He has planned to do great things as a medical missionary. The reader will be interested in Miss Williams' treatment of the subject—the very human story of a man who surmounted great obstacles and became a great surgeon. A strong love interest runs throughout the story: 'Lonely for a girl never to have a home. I could give her a good time,' he thought, deceiving himself. 'If she is willing to have a blind man for a guide.' His castles in the air rose beautiful at his desire. They were such as no builder had fashioned. This book also gives interesting glimpses of the lives of medical missionaries.

EDITOR.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Hibbert Journal (April).—Dr. Mowat in ‘The Treachery of the Intellectuals’ discusses Julian Benda’s charge that the clerks have lost their intellectual integrity and stopped the moral progress of mankind. ‘To-day, with the clerks supporting, not combating, popular prejudice, there seems little chance of human nature being further raised.’ Two standards of morality and justice cannot exist for ever side by side and the clerks who justify the State, when it acts only on motives of interest and self-love are committing treason against the cause of truth and justice, to serve which is their sole profession, and throwing back human nature on itself mobilized by instinct, passion, prejudice, and self-interested calculation. Mr. Collins of Westcott House, Cambridge, writes ‘In defence of Loisy.’ He asks if Christianity is really impoverished when Christ is regarded as only the ‘pale Galilean,’ as by Loisy? May Loisy not be regarded as ‘a figure who has taken a great step in causing the Christian religion to clothe itself in a new theological form,’ which shall give it freedom to expand and adopt itself to meet the needs of a modern world? Mr. Collins’ special pleading will not carry conviction to most Christian thinkers. ‘Bede and Alcuin,’ by A. L. Maycock, is an interesting study of two great Christian scholars whose lives are still an inspiration for those who know them. ‘Continental Protestantism and English Dissent’; ‘Demonic Powers: The Case for reality’; Dr. Foakes Jackson’s tribute to ‘Anna Comnena,’ will be read with special interest.

The Journal of Theological Studies (April).—Under ‘Documents’ Ruth J. Dean contributes an illuminating article on ‘An Early Fragment of a Manuscript of St. Augustine’s Sermons on the Gospel According to St. John.’ ‘Notes and Studies’ include articles on ‘The Recovery of the “Septuagint,”’ by Dr. W. E. Barnes, ‘Two Samaritan MSS. in the Library of Queens’ College, Cambridge,’ by C. W. Dugmore, ‘Notes on the Psalms,’ by G. R. Driver, ‘The Boharic Pericope of III Kingdoms xviii, 36-39,’ by O. H. E. Burmester, and ‘The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke’s Gospel and Acts,’ by the Rev. M. Kiddie. In an excellent list Dr. F. C. Burkitt contributes reviews of the following works: *Die Zusammensetzung des Markus-evangeliums* (J. Sundwall), *The Celtic Gospels* (L. J. Hopkin-James), *The Texts of Acts in Codex 614 (Tisch. 137) and its Allies* (A. V. Valentine-Richards, J. M. Creed), *The Chester Beatty Papyri* (F. G. Kenyon).

The Congregational Quarterly (April).—To this attractive number Dr. T. W. Manson contributes ‘The Christology of the New Testament.’ His object is not the re-statement of Christology but the more modest task of trying to discover from the N.T. what it is that systematic theology must re-state if they really mean to re-state the Christian faith, and not to found a new religion. C. Elliott Dodds writes on ‘A Modern Seer: The Poet-Scientist, Ronald Campbell Macfie.’ Owen Rattenbury, writing as a Methodist on ‘What Methodism

Owes to Dissent' says, 'We can accept no bouquets from the Dissenters for having deepened their spiritual life without giving our own thanks to them for the spirit of freedom with which they have endowed us.' Charles Carter writes on 'Art for Religion's Sake,' and Dr. H. Elvet Lewis contributes three original hymns. Under the section 'Developments and Experiments,' Donald N. Veitch has a stimulating paper on, 'The Challenge of the Christian Communist Community,' and the Editor describes the 'Question Services' which have been a feature of the worship at Clapton Park Congregational Church in recent years.

Expository Times (April).—'The Epistles of the Imprisonment in Recent Discussion,' by Professor G. S. Duncan, states his hypothesis that Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians were written during St. Paul's ministry at Ephesus. He meets some objections and quotes various opinions on the question. Professor T. H. Robinson pays tribute to 'Karl Budde' who died on January 29. He was not only a great Old Testament scholar but also an expert critic of painting and general literature and an enthusiastic musician. Dr. James Reid, of Eastbourne, writes on 'Things Most Certainly Believed.' He believes that 'God can be known by every man so that His purpose may become the guiding principle of man's life.'

Church Quarterly (April).—'The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel,' by W. H. Rigg, dwells on its exhibition of Christianity as the true mystical religion. 'Church and Religion in England, 1660-1800,' by Ponsonby Sullivan, includes Dr. Simon's *John Wesley, The Last Phase* in its sources. The writer says: 'The Methodist revival and the zeal and devotion of Wesley stirred up personal religious life—a popular enthusiasm quite lacking in the Church.' 'The High Church Movement in Victorian Fiction' is an interesting study of Charlotte M. Yonge's stories.

Baptist Quarterly (April).—Mr. Whitley writes a valuable account of 'Thomas Helwys of Gray's Inn and Broxtowe Hall, Nottingham,' with nine pages of illustrations. Harold C. Rowse discusses 'The Barthian Challenge to Christian Thought.' Careful attention is given to his primary interest in preaching. H. J. Flowers brings out the personal side of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. 'Some Sidelights on Pearce and his friends' and 'Robert and James Haldane' are of much interest.

Groups (May).—This journal maintains a high standard. Articles include 'Learning to Pray' by R. V. Spivey, 'Churchman' writes on 'Devotional Bible Reading,' and Canon Spencer H. Elliott on 'Gospel Studies.' In 'The Triumph of the Cross' Dr. Maldwyn Edwards says: 'Christ accepted the Cross and made it his throne; an immediate defeat became a final victory . . . The secret is still in the Cross. We may find there not a way of life but life.'

British Journal of Inebriety (April) gives special report of Dr. Percy Thornton's address on 'Methylated Spirit Drinking.' He is the chief medical officer of the Salvation Army. Dr. Brasher writes on

'Idiosyncrasy and Drug Reactions,' and Reviews and Notices of Books and Memoranda fill twenty-one pages.

The International Review of Missions (April).—Dr. Addison writes on 'Group Conversion in Medieval Europe'; Mr. Philip on 'The Harijan Movement in India in Relation to Christianity'; Mr. Machin on 'The Church in Hindustan.' There are articles on 'Sharing with Africans'; on 'India and the Religious Life,' and many other international missionary problems.

AMERICAN

Religion in Life (Spring).—'Certainty' brings out the need preachers feel for some sure word of God, some certainty. 'Karl Marx and Fredrich Nietzsche' is a 'Study of Ways of Salvation.' Henry Sloane Coffin asks 'Can Liberalism Survive?' Boynton Merrill's subject is 'The Timeliness of Preaching the Timeless.' There are valuable articles on 'Japan turns to the Past,' 'Archæology and the Bible,' 'Karl Barth's Fight for Soul Liberty,' 'The Christian and War,' and 'The Pacifist's Dilemma.' It is a varied and important number.

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (March), gives a rendering of Hosea iv.—xv. in rhythm to match that of the Hebrew. It is by Earle B. Cross and is headed 'Love Strives with Justice.' This notable rendering is in dramatic form. 'The Torrey Gospels' are the subject of an important critical study. Professor Berry gives a detailed account of 'Christian Customs in Palestine and Transjordan' based on his experience in 1933–4 as Professor in the American School of Research in Jerusalem.

FOREIGN

The Visva-Bharati Quarterly (May–July—Vol. 1, Part I, New Series).—The Editor, J. R. Kripalani, aims to bring together from distant parts of the world 'writers, scholars, and artists—who, through disinterested pursuit of knowledge or creation or contemplation of beauty, are adding to the cultural heritage of Man.' A distinguished list of writers includes Rabindranath Tagore who contributes articles on 'Art and Tradition' and 'The Function of Literature.' In the former he describes art as the response of man's creative soul to the call of the real, and in the latter he thinks of literature as 'a divine inspiration, striving in every country, every age, every language, to find its way through our hearts into outside forms of everlasting joy.' This journal founded by Rabindranath Tagore, is well printed and well illustrated. Its breadth of outlook and high literary standard should gain a wide constituency.

The Moslem World (April).—'Da Costa's Hagar,' one of the finest missionary poems of the world, is the subject of an interesting paper by Dr. Zwemer. 'Religious Liberty in Iraq' notes a distinct advance on conditions in pre-war days. 'The Spirit of Islam in Sumatra' is one of bitter opposition to Christianity. 'My Friend the Effendi'; 'The New and the Old Islam' are other papers of interest.

s of

rites
The
chin
with
ther

need
Karl
ion.'
rill's
are
the
Var,'
er.

ring
It is
This
the
ailed
ased
ol of

s).—
tant
ough
n of
shed
icles
the
the
vine
age,
ting
nted
dard

nest
aper
ance
stra'
ndi';